

SELECTIONS FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE

ON THE

RE-SETTLEMENT OF THE MAJNAMUTA
AND JELLAMUTA ESTATES

IN THE

DISTRICT OF MIDNAPORE

Calcutta:

PRINTED AT THE BENGAL SECRETARIAT PRESS.

1882.

Processo Administrativo Público - 1995
n.º 977... 24.5.95

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
PART I. —Mr. Price's report on Majnamuta	1
Board's report on ditto	35
Government orders on ditto	62
PART II. —Mr. Price's report on Jellamuta	71
Board's report on ditto	102
Government orders on ditto	124
PART III. —Correspondence regarding grammbheries and drainage channels in Majnamuta and Jellamuta	131

PART I.

REPORT BY THE SETTLEMENT OFFICER, MR. J. C. PRICE, ON THE REGULAR RE-SETTLEMENT OF THE MAJNAMUTA ESTATE, COMPRISING ELEVEN PERGUNNAHS.

1. I DEEM it right, before entering upon the details of the re-settlement, to furnish a history of the estate. It is said to be ascertained from certain papers, which are described as the "Analysis of the Revenue of Bengal, by Mr. Chief Sheristadar Grant," that the

* The note (appendix 1) annexed to this report will show what pergunnahs were originally said to be contained in the tract of country called Ingellee (Hidgellee) in the old records extant in the Midnapore Collectorate.

Fouzdary of Hidgellee* was first dismembered from the Soobah of Orissa and annexed to that of Bengal in the reign of Shah Jehan. Hidgellee at that time apparently contained 28 pergunnahs, which in 1707 A.D. (or Wilaity 1115) yielded a yearly revenue of Rs. 3,41,384, exclusive of the salt mehal, which was then valued at Rs. 43,565 only. Later, several accessions were made to what had come to be called the chuckla of Hidgellee, which comprised 38 pergunnahs in 1135 A.S. (1728, A.D.) ; all united in the single zemindary trust of Sukdeo, and yet sub-divided into five portions, denominated Jellamuta, Doro Dumnán, Mahisadul, Toomooluck, and Sujamuta. The ausil jumma or crown rent from 1135 to 1172 A.S. (1728 to 1765 A.D.) of the chuckla of Hidgellee was Rs. 4,77,947, and the nimkee or salt mehal yielded Rs. 43,365. Apparently all five sub-divisions were comprised in what was called the Circar Maljeteah.

Division and Pergunnahs.		Ausil jum- ma of 1135.
I.—Jellamuta (Luckhinarain). • Rs.		
Jellamuta {	Pergunnah Jellamuta ...	36,517
	" Keoramal ...	55,146
	" Dacanmal ...	13,245
	" Rakory ...	7,383
	" Bahadurpore ...	11,959
	" Gaomesh ...	598
	" Noychuck Bazar ...	959
	" Wyhatgurra ...	808
	Balshahi ...	1,308
	Bircool ...	5,928
	Agrajoor ...	4,173
Circar Maljeteah {	Mirgoda ...	2,915
	Bhogrye Circar Mussoory ...	11,601
TOTAL OF JELLAMUTA		1,64,224

In the margin I have given the names of the pergunnahs which constituted the two sub-divisions of Jellamuta (Luckhinarain) and Doro Dumnán (Jadabram) ; which have come under re-settlement. Before going further, however, I wish to quote from a letter written on the 13th October by Mr. Crommelin, the Collector of Hidgellee, in 1812—
"Sekunder Pulwan, the

Division and Pergunnahs.		Ausil jum- ma of 1135.
II.—Doro Dumnan (Jadabram).		Rs.
Circar Maljeeth.	Pergunnah Majnamutan	52,919
	„ Doro Dumnan	30,451
	„ Arwamuta	15,738
	„ Kusba Hidgellee	2,138
	„ Grambhery	1,081
	„ Hoseinabad (apparently the present Nyabad)	466
	„ Debmota (not traceable)	2,444
	„ Sarifabad	4,072
	„ Amirabad	919
	„ Balijora	4,763
	„ Pataspore Circar Muscoory	9,688
	„ Shipore and Jellaspore	2,798
Total of Doro Dumnan ..		<u>1,27,481 (sic.)</u>

elder brother of Musnund Ali Shah, who is held in the highest veneration in these parts, is said to have conquered the whole of the Hidgellee district between the years 912 and 952 Wilaity (1505 and 1545 A.D.) for his brother. After his death, which happened in 961 Wilaity (1554 A.D.), Musnund Ali, who was a holy man and no warrior, understanding that the King had ordered a large

force to be sent against him, is reported in 962 Wilaity (1555 A.D.) to have buried himself alive. His son, Bahadoor Cawn, made his peace at Court, and was regularly confirmed in the possession of the district in 963 Wilaity (1556 A.D.). He had a dewan named Bheem Sen Mohapatra, who had also been the dewan of his father Musnund Ali. This man had in his service Kistna Panda, a Brahmin, for his cook, and a man named Issory Patnaik, who acted as his sircar, keeping the accounts of his private expenses. Bheem Sen Mohapatra is stated at a very advanced period of life to have sunk himself with

*Note.—A permanently-settled pergunnah in Hidgellee.

his whole family in a large tank in Bahirimuta;* and on his death Kistna Panda and Issory Patnaik, in concert with Zeil Cawn, a son-in-law of Musnund Ali, preferred complaints against Bahadoor Cawn to the King, who ordered him to be imprisoned about 970 W. (1563 A.D.). Zeil Cawn then became possessed of the district, but lost it again in 980 W. (1573 A.D.) in consequence of Bahadoor Cawn having regained his liberty and his authority. On the death of Bahadoor Cawn, about the year 990 W. (1583 A.D.), Kistna Panda and Issory Patnaik had influence enough to procure grants from the King, respectively, of certain pergunnahs in the district, which (probably with some trifling variations) now form the separate zemindaries of Jellamuta and Majnamuta."

2. Issory Patnaik got possession of the Majnamuta zemindary in 991 A.S. (1584 A.D.). He died in 1020 A.S. (1613 A.D.), leaving two sons, the elder of whom, Jagamohun Choudhry, succeeding his father, died in 1040 A.S. (1633 A.D.). Jagamohun had two wives, and two sons by each wife; the elder son of his first wife, by name Dwarkanath Das, succeeded him, and died in 1050 A.S. (1643 A.D.). Instead of being succeeded by his eldest son, Kripanidhi Choudhry, he was followed by his half-brother, Raikishore Choudhry, who forcibly took possession of the zemindary to the exclusion of his nephew, and held it till his death in 1100 A.S. (1693 A.D.), when he was succeeded by his only son Bhupati Roy, who died 1145 A.S. (1738 A.D.). Bhupati Roy having no male issue was succeeded by his grandson, the son of a daughter by a second wife, whose name

was Parbati Charan Roy. He died in 1152 A.S. (1745 A.D.), and was succeeded, it is said, owing to the influence of Mustapha Khan with the Nawab of Moorshedabad, by Jadabram Roy, the grandson of Dwarkanath Das, by his eldest son Kripanidhi Choudhry; the property thereby reverting to the possession of the representative of the elder line, whose undoubted right to the zemindary had been all this time kept in wrongful abeyance. Jadabram dying in 1187 A.S. (1780 A.D.) was succeeded by his eldest son Kuarnarain Roy, who dying in 1190 A.S. (1783 A.D.) was succeeded by his only son Joynarain Roy, who, dying without issue, was succeeded in 1192 A.S. (1785 A.D.) by his step-mother, the second wife of his father, Rani Sugandha. She died in 1210 A.S. (1803 A.D.) and the succession became an object of the most determined litigation. The Sudder Dewanny Adawlut acknowledged and confirmed the rights of Shamaprasad Nandi, the son of Bishenpriamani, Jadabram's daughter by his second wife; of Ananda Lal Choudhry, Nand Lal Choudhry, Modhusudun Choudhry, and Gunga Narain Choudhry, the four sons of Haripriamani, Jadabram's daughter by his third wife; and of Luckhinarain Roy, son of Kuchalalmani, Haripriamani's daughter. These were the proprietors in 1836, when Mr. Ricketts wrote of Majnamuta in the following terms: "That name," he says, "cannot be new to the Board; the great Majnamuta estate appears to have occupied the attention of the superior revenue authorities and the Government more than any tract of equal extent in British India. The property, in consequence of the recusance of the proprietors, was let in farm or held khas from the period of the Decennial Settlement till 1826, when it was determined to measure and settle that portion of the whole estate comprised in Majnamuta, Balijora, Sarifabad, Amirabad, and Nyabad, under the rules of Regulation VII of 1822. This task occupied between four and five years, was at length, after most voluminous proceedings and correspondence, completed, reported, and, with certain exceptions and reservations, approved. In August 1831 the proprietors, after upwards of 30 years' dispossession, accepted the terms offered, and engaged. Within two months the inundation of October 1831 swept the greater portion of the estate. The zemindars requested that the lease might be cancelled; khas management was resumed; and all the pains, trouble, and expense incurred in the settlement were rendered altogether unavailing. The storms of 6th October 1832 and May 1833, and especially the latter, completed the devastation; there are now large tracts without an inhabitant; the soil and that injured alone remains." I wish to quote in addition the words used by the Commissioner, (Mr. Mills) in 1845—"Kusba Hidgellee suffered the most, Doro Duman the next greatest injury, and the loss of life and property was most deplorable; houses were washed down, tanks poisoned, bunds swept away, and the greater part of the land was impregnated with salt. The ascertained destruction of life was stated at 2,472 human beings and 17,927 head of cattle. All the local officers are unanimous in stating that the resources of the estate at large have not yet fully recovered from the disastrous effects of these visitations of Providence."

3. Having in the foregoing paragraph given a brief description of the several proprietors who succeeded to the possession of the estate down to 1836, I wish to go back again to the time of the Permanent Settlement, and to explain the manner in which the property was managed down to the year when Mr. Ricketts wrote. Sugandha Rani refused the permanent settlement of her estate when it was offered to her, and it was either let in farm in hudahs or detached portions, or held khas from her time till 1238 A.S. (1831 A.D.). The collections during the various terms included in this interval are given in the margin. These sums represent the net proceeds after payment of malikana, collection expenses, and other items. During this interval also the Government, on the consideration that it enjoyed the exclusive privilege of manufacturing salt, at first granted a money allowance from the treasury under the name of <i>moshahera</i> to the excluded zemindars. In 1196 A.S. (1789 A.D.) a further addition was made as compensation for salt profits. Besides these two allowances the proprietors were in the receipt of what was called <i>nankar</i> , another name for malikana; the total sum on account of all these items amounting in 1200 A.S. (1793 A.D.) to			
	Rs.	A.	P.
1189 to 1197	82,853	7	2½
1198	80,339	1	0½
1199 to 1201	80,211	15	11½
1202	94,253	0	8
1203	94,857	13	5½
1204	95,457	7	1
1205	96,078	1	8½
1206	96,106	10	10
1207	96,114	2	4½
1208 to 1216	1,03,457	1	2½
1217 to 1226	1,12,036	8	6
1227	1,03,024	12	8½
1228 & 1229	1,03,039	11	11½
1230	1,01,368	3	7½
1231	1,01,520	3	11½
1232	1,01,520	8	2½
1233	1,09,966	11	7½
1234	1,00,986	15	7½
1235	1,10,917	8	1
1236	1,19,342	0	8½
1237	1,20,338	8	3½
1238	1,55,554	3	5
1239	1,11,555	2	5½
1240	1,60,308	2	2½
1241	66,731	4	6½
1242	75,634	4	5½
1243	63,358	6	7½
1244	96,363	3	7½
1245	95,567	3	7½
1246	1,08,204	13	9½
1247	1,08,813	6	9½
1248	1,17,025	1	2
1249	1,27,822	13	1½
1250	1,26,398	10	6½
1251	1,27,747	5	4½
1252	1,17,071	5	9

Rs. 23,847 15a. 19g. 2k. In that year the authorities intended to make a permanent settlement of the entire Majnamuta estate, giving the proprietors one-eleventh of the estimated net proceeds; the deficiency in the proposed allowances, in comparison with those which they had hitherto enjoyed, being made up to them by cash payments in the Salt Department. The proprietors refused the Permanent Settlement, but still received Rs. 24,071 6a. 9g. 1k., the *nankar* or malikana being Rs. 9,320 12a. 17g. 2k. and the salt allowance Rs. 14,750 12a. 9g. In 1238 A.S. (1831 A.D.) the proprietors engaged for the five pergunnahs aforementioned settled by Mr. Wyatt, receiving both *moshahera* as well as salt profits; in 1241 A.S. (1834 A.D.) they were excluded from engagement, as will be seen hereafter, and payment of profits was discontinued.

4. In 1239 A.S. (1832 A.D.), 1240 A.S. (1833 A.D.), 1241 A.S. (1834 A.D.), 1242 A.S. (1835 A.D.) nine pergunnahs of the estate were managed khas, two remaining in farm: khas management, however, proved unsuccessful. In 1243 A.S. (1836 A.D.) the proprietors were put in possession of all the pergunnahs save the two farmed, receiving malikana at 20 per cent. for some pergunnahs, at 30 per cent. for others, and the jummas of all the pergunnahs being progressive. The share of one recalcitrant proprietor was farmed out to his co-parceners. In 1244 A.S. (1837 A.D.) the farmer of Naruamuta

committed default in payment of revenue, and the pergunnah was made over to the proprietors. In 1247 A.S. (1840 A.D.) the crops on the estate suffered extensively from drought, and a fourth part of the jumma had to be remitted. In 1248 A.S. (1841 A.D.) the farmer of Kusba Hidgellee failed to make good his payments; an elaborate enquiry into the resources of the pergunnah was instituted, and finally the proprietors expressed their willingness to engage. In the same year the proprietors committed default in payment; they claimed remissions on account of losses sustained from inundation and drought, but the Collector sold the entire estate for arrears of revenue. The Commissioner cancelled this sale as illegal; the proprietors paid up a large portion of the balances, but again fell into arrears, when their engagements were revoked under the provisions of section 6 of Regulation IX of 1825. In 1249 A.S. (1842 A.D.) the rents of Majna Nyabad, Sarifabad, Amirabad, Balijora, and Naruamuta were collected from the ryots. Doro Dumnun was leased for five years * * * Kismut Pataspore, Datta Khoroi, and Shibpore were farmed, * * * and Kusba Hidgellee also. In 1251 A.S. (1844 A.D.) Balijora, Amirabad, Sarifabad Nyabad, and Majnamuta were let in farm for four years, Naruamuta remaining khas. In 1251 A.S. (1844 A.D.) the farmers of Datta Khoroi, kismut Shibpore, and kismut Pataspore became defaulters to a large amount; but it having been ascertained that the farming jumma was ruinously high, the lease was continued on the understanding that the jumma would be revised, and the demand fixed with retrospective effect on the basis of the information that would be obtained during the settlement proceedings that were then in progress. From 1252 A.S. (1845 A.D.) effect was given to the provisions of the last regular settlement that was made of this estate; the farming jumma was re-calculated on the basis of the information supplied thereby, and a deduction of 20 per cent. was made for expenses of collection.

5. This settlement, which I may mention is the only real settlement that has ever been effected of the Majnamuta estate, was begun in 1841 and was completed in 1845. Mr. Grote, as Superintendent of Settlement, supervised the work of 11 Deputy Collectors, to whom were allotted two or more of the 21 pergunnahs contained in the two estates of Majnamuta and Jellamuta; the last-mentioned estate having come under settlement also.

6. Majnamuta in 1845 comprised the 11 pergunnahs noted in the margin, interspersed among those of Jellamuta. Their united area was bighas 3,67,763-9, 2 bighas from which, after deduction of the lands of nankar, transferred to the towji of sudder mehals, of khaspatit mehals, and of other similar estates, there remained bighas 3,25,116-8-6 to be actually accounted for. The equivalents in acres of these last mentioned figures is 108,372, in which are included

local bighas 59,749-15-15 of jalpai land in the possession

Amirabad.
Balijora.
Doro Dumnun.
Datta Khoroi.
Kismut Pataspore.
" Shibpore.
Kusba Hidgellee.
Majnamuta.
Naruamuta.
Nyabad Majna.
Sarifabad.

of the Salt Agent. The gross assessment of the estate amounted to Rs. 2,08,977-6-8 $\frac{3}{4}$. But of this sum Rs. 59,738-14-0 $\frac{1}{2}$ were obtained from the assessment after resumption of akhrajat, nankar, naziran, junglebooree, chowkidars' jaghir, and other rent-free tenures, or tenures held on a peshkush or pepper-corn rent. No part of the assets of the settlements of antecedent periods was derived from this source. The allowances to be deducted from the mofussil assets amounted in some pergunnahs, or rather localities, to Rs. 40, in others to Rs. 35 per cent.; the sudder jumma then became Rs. 1,16,214; a further deduction had to be made for chowkidars' wages, amounting to Rs. 7,811-8 and the remainder, Rs. 1,08,402-8-5 $\frac{3}{4}$, was the revenue derived from the estate. The jummas, which were progressive from

	Rs.	A.	P.
1252 ...	95,016	9	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1253 ...	1,18,600	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$
1254 ...	1,04,355	11	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
1255 ...	1,04,749	5	9
1256 ...	1,06,249	12	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1257 ...	1,07,311	11	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
1258 ...	1,07,842	8	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1259 ...	1,08,376	6	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
1260 } to ... 1274 }	1,08,402	8	5 $\frac{1}{2}$

1252 to 1274 A.S. (1845 to 1867 A.D.), are detailed in the margin, and show that the maximum in 1260 A.S. (1853 A.D.) was less than the collections made in 1250 and 1251 A.S. (1843 and 1844 A.D.), and far below the collections in 1237 and 1238 A.S. (1830 and 1831 A.D.), which were Rs. 1,28,334-5-7 and Rs. 1,52,737, respectively, in sicca rupees. The principal circumstance which tended to diminish in 1845 A.D. the revenue of the estate was the excess of the allowances then

made over those which were thought sufficient formerly. Mr. Wyatt in 1832 allowed only 20 per cent. malikana and 7 per cent. collection expenses; in 1200 A.S. (1793 A.D.) malikana at the rate of 10 per cent. was awarded; whereas in 1243 A.S. (1836 A.D.) Mr. Ricketts thought that 30 per cent. was not excessive for some pergunnahs, the others being limited to 20 per cent. The tendency of the age seems to have been gradually to increase the proprietors' allowances; and when it is remembered that, whereas the gross assets in 1845 A.D. gained an addition of more than Rs. 50,000, the net revenue still was considerably below what it used to be, the real effect of the great indulgence granted to the zemindar will be strikingly apparent.

7. With regard to statistics, I shall state that the estate in 1845 A.D. comprised 1,004 villages. The population was said to number about 85,000 only; 40,000 of whom were men, 25,000 women, and the rest children; $\frac{1}{16}$ ths were Hindoos; $\frac{1}{16}$ ths were Moslems. It was said that $\frac{2}{16}$ ths knew how to read and write Bengali, and $\frac{1}{16}$ ths had the same knowledge with regard to Uriya. There were 200 patshalas, but it is observed that within the meaning of the word patshala was reckoned every place where two or three youths collected round a Brahmin to learn to read the Shasters. An Anglo-vernacular school was much needed. The most common ailments and diseases were elephantiasis, cholera, small-pox, and disordered spleen.

8. The principal features of the Majnamuta settlement are that in Naruamuta the jungle covered the greater portion of the pergunnah. Throughout the estate the greater portion of the culturable land was left unassessed. Some of it no doubt had been purposely put or left out of cultivation with intent to impose on the Settlement

Officer, but the greater portion had been extensively injured by salt-water inundations.

9. Mr. Bayley's settlement of Majnamuta was to have a term of 24 years from 1250 to 1274 A.S.; and the jumma, as will have been noticed, was progressive till 1260 A.S. (1853 A.D.), when it reached its maximum amount, Rs. 1,08,402-8-5 $\frac{1}{4}$. In 1851 the proprietors committed default in payment of the revenue, and Mr. Bayley, who had become the Collector of the district of Midnapore, brought the estate under khas management agreeably to the provisions of Act IX of 1825. This administration continued for 15 years down to the year 1865, the collections being made through the medium of farmers. In 1866 the Collector, Mr. Herschel, summarily settled the estate for one year, the conditions undergoing no change save in one particular. Hitherto the khalaria rents due to the proprietors had been included in the sudder jumma, and payments made on this account used to be debited to land revenue. A sum equivalent to this khalaria rent was assessed by Mr. Herschel on the waste lands of the estate, and being included in the revenue assets, was considered a set off to the khalaria rent, payment of which was stopped, and the jumma therefore suffered no change. The proprietors objected very strongly to this arrangement, but were over-ruled.

10. In 1867, on the expiry of the term of the summary settlement, the estate was temporarily settled for five years on the same conditions as before, pending a regular detailed re-measurement and re-assessment which were in contemplation. Proceedings towards this re-settlement were not begun by me till January 1874; but as in the meantime the term of the five years' summary settlement had expired, the estate had been allowed to remain in the hands of the proprietors, on the same conditions as before for an indefinite period, which was to terminate with the completion of the present re-settlement proceedings. In 1875, however, four of the six proprietors committed default in payment of Government revenue, and the estate was brought under khas management, and given into my charge. The rents are being collected directly from the ryots. The foregoing remarks will have sufficiently explained the cause and origin of the present re-settlement. The right of Government in the estate in its present condition extends to its appropriating as land revenue that portion of the gross assets which remains after deduction of malikana in favour of the proprietors. I now proceed to give the details of re-settlement.

BOUNDARIES.

11. The Majnamuta estate, consisting of the 11 pergunnahs noted in the margin, is contained

Doro Dumnan.
Majnamuta.
Kismut Shipore.
Datta Khoroi.
Balijora.
Amirabad.

Majna Nyabad.
Saritabad.
Naruanuta.
Kismut 'ataspore.
Kusba Hidqellea.

in three blocks or detached portions. One block, made up of the single pergunnah of Doro Dumnan, is bounded on the north, east, and south by the river Hooghly, and on

the west by permanently-settled pergunnahs Kasimnagar and Maisadul. The second block, consisting of the next nine marginally noted pergunnahs, is bounded on the north by the river Rasulpore, and by pergunnahs Bhuniamuta,* Sujamuta,* Bajarapore,* and Pataspore;† on the east partly by the Bay of Bengal and the river Hooghly, and partly by taraf Erinch;‡ on the south partly by pergunnah Kalindi Balshahi; and partly by the Bay of Bengal; and on the west by pergunnahs Khalsa Bhograi,§ Shipore,* Egra,* Paharpore,‡ Pataspore,† and Pratapbhan.* The third and last block is made up of the 11th pergunnah Kusba Hidgellee, and is bounded on the north by taraf Bisuan;‡ on the east partly by taraf Bisuan and partly by the Bay of Bengal; on the south by the Bay of Bengal; and on the west by the river Rasulpore.

It is not to be supposed that these blocks contain only land belonging to the estate. In them are situated 1,023 villages belonging to Majnamuta, and 137 entire villages belonging to other estates, both temporarily as well as permanently settled. Some villages of a pergunnah of the estate are quite detached from the remaining villages of that pergunnah; they then lie either in a compact block or are scattered in other pergunnahs of the estate, or in pergunnahs of the Jellamuta estate, which is also under re-settlement. Occasionally a pergunnah, Sarifabad for instance, is made up of villages composed of fields interspersed among the fields of the villages of other pergunnahs of the estate. The fields in some villages of a pergunnah of the estate will be found interspersed with the fields of villages belonging to the Jellamuta estate. Some villages of the estate consist wholly of revenue-paying (mal) land, others contain the three kinds of mal, lakhiraj and resumed lakhiraj, whether of petty tenures or of independent estates, bearing a separate number on the rent-roll of the district; all almost inextricably intermixed within the village area.

BOUNDARY DISPUTES.

(a) There were seven disputes regarding boundaries in connection with the lands of other estates. The disputed area amounted to 170*b.* 7*c.* 11½*b.*, of which 101*b.* 17*c.* 5½*b.* were assigned to the estate, and 68*b.* 10*c.* 6*b.* assigned to other estates—either Jellamuta (temporarily-settled) or Dantamuta, Egrachor, Bahirimuta, and Dacanmal (permanently-settled). Besides these there were four disputes regarding the boundaries of two adjoining pergunnahs of the estate itself. The area of land involved in such disputes was 87*b.* 15*c.* 9*b.*; the pergunnahs concerned being Datta Khoroi, kismut Pataspore, Balijora, Sarifabad, and Majnamuta. The disputes regarding boundaries of villages in the same pergunnah, or regarding the boundaries of holdings in one and the same village, were innumerable, but are not worthy of any special mention here.

SYSTEM OF MEASUREMENT.

12. There were only non-professional ameens employed in the survey of the estate, and they followed generally the system of measurement partially described in section 3 of chapter XX of the Board's rules, a few modifications being introduced to secure presumably more accurate results. Of course the Government standard of six feet was used, 20 of which in length by 20 in breadth make a standard bigha of 14,400 square feet. More correctly speaking, a chain 30 feet long was used by the ameens. The local standard of measure is 7 feet $10\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, 20 of which by 16 in breadth make a local bigha, containing 19,845 square feet. After the areas of fields were computed in standard bighas they were reduced to local bighas, to enable application of the local rates to be made, and to render the measurements intelligible to the ryots, who professed inability to understand what was meant by the phrase "Government standard bigha." An additional column was inserted in the chittahs or schedules where the area in local bighas of each field was shown.

(a) Calculation of areas in acres was made only for the sake of comparison with former recorded acreage, or with present professional survey acreage. Wherever any marked difference from the area of the former settlement was noticed, the most careful local enquiries were made to reconcile discrepancies. The difference from professional survey areas resulted for the most part from the thakbust survey department, whose plans the professional survey followed, having taken other than the real boundaries of villages. The settlement department took the boundary which the papers of the former settlement showed was the correct boundary, and which the ryots in occupation of the land involved in the difference between settlement and survey (thakbust) demarcations pointed out to be such. In the absence of disputes this was the best guide that the settlement department could have.

(b) To ensure accuracy in computing areas of individual fields on the part of the ameens their statements were compared with a certain percentage of areas calculated by a professional computer using the talc square on the ameen's village plan. In every case the aggregate area of the fields of a village was compared with the area of that village professionally computed.

(c) In places where cultivation had not extended, where land lay fallow, or there was jungle; in fact, wherever field embankments (āl अल) were not recognized, and cadastral measurements were unnecessary, mehalwar measurements were made; that is, the outer boundary of the block of land was surveyed and plotted, the area being professionally computed from the plan. A similar course was adopted where the whole or any portion of the area of a village had not come under re-settlement, such as lakhiraj, resumed lakhiraj, and the like; and where the block was of some extent, the land not being composed of small fields interspersed among the fields of the revenue-paying portion of the village area. For further information regarding the system of measurement, and the mode of testing the

ameen's work, I beg that a reference be made to paragraph 11 of my report on the re-settlement of the Jellamuta estate. The same ameens were employed both in Majnamuta and Jellamuta. The area of the estate in 1845 was 264,898*b.* 1*c.* 15*b.* 3*g.* local bighas (acreage 120,613-1-12); it is now ascertained to be 271,790*b.* 7*c.* 4*b.* 7*g.* (123,921*a.* 0*r.* 16*p.*), or an increase of 6,892*b.* 5*c.* 5*b.* 4*g.* has resulted. This is not a very serious difference. I can explain it in no other way than by impugning the accuracy of the former measurements, which were entirely according to the native system, where the plotting of plans was altogether dispensed with. Wherever there was jungle the ameens in 1845 made guesses at the area; in the present day jungle for the most part has disappeared, and cultivation has advanced. The ameens make plans, and are bound to account for every plot of land, if for nothing else, for the proper closing up of the village plan.

DESCRIPTION OF THE LAND.

13. There are two kinds of land in the estate—*kala* or high land, and *jal* or rice land. The former is sub-divided into *bastu* or homestead land, and *dhasa* or high land suitable for the cultivation of cold-weather crops. The *dhasa* has several classifications, such as *balu dhasa*, so called because of the admixture of a considerable modicum of sand with the soil; or such as *balu badam*, which derives its appellation from the peculiar produce which it yields. *Dhasa* on which ordinary cold-weather crops grow is of various degrees of productiveness, and is classified into *dhasa awal*, *dhasa doyam*, *dhasa soyam*, the equivalents being first class *dhasa*, second class *dhasa*, third class *dhasa*. The *dhasa* in the estate, and in fact throughout *Hidgellee*, is nowhere of the very best kind of high land; valuable crops such as mulberry and sugarcane are never or very rarely grown. The ordinary cold-weather crops which are produced in the estate may be thus enumerated—mustard, linseed, cotton, *biri*, flax, radish, brinjals, other native vegetables, melons, pumpkins, coconuts, and betel-leaf. The *jal* or rice land also is subdivided into first, second, and third quality, according to different degrees of fertility. It is in comparison with the *dhasa* or high land by no means of a generally inferior quality; in some of the *pergunnahs* of the estate it produces most luxuriant crops of paddy. The land of the estate being altogether alluvial is pretty generally of the same level; there is, however, one deviation from this rule in the existence of a range of sand hills occasionally rising to the height of 50 feet, running through the *pergunnahs* of *Balijora*, *Majnamuta*, *Sarifabad*, and *Kusba Hidgellee* from east to west, and situated at a distance varying from half to four miles from the sea. On the range of sand hills the *ryots* of the villages which contain them have their dwellings, and the land where cultivated is generally of the kind called *dhasa*. It is not improbable that in times long past the sea washed the base of these sand hills; their origin does not seem to be known with any degree of certainty

A very good description of them is given in the appendix II, which is a quotation from appendix No. III (geographical report) by Major Sconce, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey. There is very little jungle in the estate inside the great embankment which runs along the sea-shore, and protects the

land from salt water inundations. There are innumerable tidal rivers and salt khalls intersecting the several pergunnahs of the estate, all of which also are embanked and in charge of the Department of Public Works. Outside the embankments, where the land is subject to salt water floodings at time of high water, there is jungle; but it is stunted in growth and seldom very dense. Clearances are in progress, and in a year or two I hope to see Hidgellee quite free from jungle, where at present some wild pigs and a few tigers have their habitation. The various salt khalls and tidal rivers serve as drainage channels for the country; to prevent all the rain water flowing off the land into which the ryots for the purpose of rice cultivation are obliged to construct grammbheries or small embankments round their villages. Without grammbheries cultivation of rice, which is the staple produce, could not be carried on in the estate. The drainage of the estate is almost perfect; so well constructed and well arranged is the system of embankments both on the sea-shore and along the rivers and khalls.

Executive Engineer of Cossye Division's letter No. 820, dated 23rd February 1878, to the address of the Collector.

Settlement Officer's letter No. 12, dated 25th April 1878, to the address of the Collector.

In pergunnah Majnamuta, however, owing to the silting up of a khall called the Kantanulla khall, it has been found difficult hitherto to keep an area of 40 square miles of country from being inundated during every rainy season. This matter has formed the subject of separate correspondence as noted in the margin.

RENT-FREE HOLDINGS.

14. The confirmed rent-free holdings in the estate have an area of 40,013*b.* 13*c.* 6*b.* contained in 3,686 tenures or estates. The area was 40,827*b.* 15*c.* 1*b.* 16*g.* at the time of the former settlement; a decrease of 814*b.* 1*c.* 11*b.* 16*g.* has resulted. Some tenures show an increase while others show a decrease, which in the gross preponderates. The cause of decrease or increase has been ascertained on local enquiries to be due to former defective measurements; and it was brought to light that the lakhirajdars had not encroached on the mal or revenue-paying lands lying adjacent to their tenures.

Majnamuta ...	1,508
Doro Dumnun ...	1,163
Naruanuta ...	258
Knsba Hidgellee ...	158
Baliyora ...	127
Sarifabad ...	55
Kt. Pataspore ...	213
Kt. Shipore ...	53
Datta Khoroi ...	121
Amirabad ...	18
Majna Nyabad ...	12
Total ...	3,683

LANDS NOT FIT TO BE ASSESSED AT PRESENT.

15. The land not fit to be assessed is 34,281*b.* 18*c.* 3*b.* 11*g.* in extent, of which 29,761*b.* 12*c.* 5*b.* 15*g.* are described as unculturable. The unassessed culturable as well as unculturable in the former

settlement was 39,975*b.* 5*c.* 11*b.* 8½*g.* The decrease in area in this kind of land since 1845 is not unsatisfactory, the total extension of cultivation being represented by an area of 5,693*b.* 7*c.* 7*b.* 17½*g.* Geriahs or small ponds in the estate were left unassessed in the former, and are similarly dealt with now.

RATES ASSESSED, AND MODE OF ASSESSMENT.

16. In the Majnamuta estate are 11 pergunnahs some of which are detached from the others ; one at least lying at a very considerable distance apart—Doro Dumnán. Interspersed among the pergunnahs of the Majnamuta estate lie the pergunnahs of the Jellamuta estate, also under re-settlement. It often happens that a pergunnah of either estate is completely surrounded by pergunnahs of one or other of the two estates, no permanently-settled pergunnah being adjacent. In such a case the only ground of enhancement of rates that assessments can be based upon is the increased productiveness of the soil or increased value of produce since the last settlement, one or other or both having been brought about independently of the agency of the ryots. Sometimes, even where a permanently-settled pergunnah adjoins, no comparison of the proposed rates with those prevailing in the permanently-settled pergunnah has been found possible, because strictly speaking the latter do not exist. Rents are collected on the utbandi system, where no regular measurement or assessment of the ryots' holdings has ever been made by the zemindars, and the ryots pay whatever they have been in the habit of paying ; in other words what they please. Unfortunately there are four such permanently-settled pergunnahs either adjoining to or interspersed among the pergunnahs of the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates ; these four are Bahirimuta Bhaitgurrh, Dacannal, and Gumgurrh. There is indeed some approximation in the last mentioned pergunnah to the principle of fixing the rent of a holding on the basis of a rate, but this principle in Gumgurrh has hitherto been but imperfectly worked, and the assessment of rents there is a very crude operation. However, at least four pergunnahs of the Majnamuta estate adjoin permanently-settled pergunnahs, where the assessment of rates is made on an intelligible and substantial basis. These pergunnahs are Naruamuta, to which adjoin permanently-settled pergunnahs Sujamuta and Bajarpore ; kismut Shipore, to which adjoins permanently-settled pergunnah Shipore ; Datta Khoroi, to which adjoin permanently settled pergunnahs Egrachor, Dantamuta, Pratapbhan, and also a temporarily-settled pergunnah whose assessment was confirmed and given effect to several years ago—Pataspore. Lastly, Kismut Pataspore, to which adjoin permanently-settled pergunnahs Pratapbhan, Bajarpore, and temporarily-settled pergunnah Pataspore. In the case of these four pergunnahs, the selection of rates has been made after careful comparison with the rates prevailing for similar kinds of land in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs, and in Pataspore. Calculations based on ascertained outturn of produce and value thereof have also been applied in three of these four pergunnahs, Naruamuta being

excepted; in demonstration of the validity of the proposed rates, and with regard to these four pergunnahs, I trust that Government will see no difficulty in confirming my assessments. I may add that in Naruamuta almost the entire number of the ryots of all but nine villages—there being 81 villages altogether—have signed the jummabundee prepared in this office; in kismut Shipore the ryots of four villages of a total of five have all of them signed the jummabundee; only 89 ryots of 546 of the fifth village, though they verbally signified assent to the assessment, have still unaccountably not come forward to sign the jummabundee. In Datta Khoroi a fraction of the ryots have signed; and in kismut Pataspore more than half have followed their example. In the case of seven pergunnahs of Majnamuta, for reasons already given, the only ground of enhancement of rates that has been worked upon in the assessment has been increased both in the productiveness of the soil and in the value of the produce in comparison with the conditions that prevailed 33 years ago. These seven pergunnahs are Amirabad, where 347 ryots of a total of 475 have signed the jummabundee; Sarifabad, where the ryots of 15 villages of a total of 25 have signed the jummabundee; Majnamuta, where it is said one-fifth of the ryots of 427 villages, have signed the jummabundee, while others without signing have expressed their willingness to accept the new assessment, only a few villages objecting altogether. Doro Dumnun, where the ryots of only six villages of a total of 129 villages have signed the jummabundee, the others refusing point blank; Kusba Hidgellee, Nyabad Majna, Balijora, where also the ryots altogether refuse their consent. There is really no reason why the ryots of Balijora should object to the new assessment; the pergunnah is adjacent to Amirabad where the ryots have almost universally accepted it, though the average rate Rs. 1-12-3 per bigha of the last mentioned pergunnah is actually in excess of the average rates proposed in Balijora Rs. 1-11. The proposed rates in each of the 11 pergunnahs have been carefully compared *inter se* in this office, and the statement (A) I annex will enable Government to institute a like comparison, and to note what rates prevail in the adjacent permanently-settled pergunnahs; even in those where the prevailing rates have not been taken into consideration at all in making the present assessment, such as Kamarpol in the Diamond Harbour sub-division, Maisadul, and Kasimnagar, all lying in proximity to Doro Dumnun; also Dacanmal, Bhaigurh, Bahirimuta, and Gungurh, the last lying contiguous to Kusba Hidgellee. The new rates proposed in some of the pergunnahs of the Jellamuta estate, such as taraf Bisuan, Nyabad Keoramal, Paharpore, Errinch, Khalsa Bhograi, Kalindi Balshahi, are also exhibited for the sake of a more exhaustive comparison. A general result of the comparison, at least with reference to those permanently-settled pergunnahs which assimilate in condition, productiveness of soil, and extent of cultivation, with the pergunnahs of the Majnamuta estate, will be that the rates prevailing for all the different kinds of land in the former will be seen to be in excess of those proposed for the latter. The rates proposed for Jellamuta will be seen to be as nearly on a par as possible with those proposed for Majnamuta.

(a) I have annexed also a statement* of produce showing the

* Marked B.

results ascertained by actual experiment during the last three years, and the estimate of outturn of produce and value thereof made in 1845 in the case of some of the 11 pergunnahs of the estate. The same disparity in profit left for the ryot that I have already noticed in the assessment of the different pergunnahs of the Jellamuta estate is observable here also; and the same general difficulty in explanation thereof arises. In Balijora the cause does not appear to lie far to seek; the productiveness of the soil in that pergunnah is greater than elsewhere, the cost of cultivation is not heavy, nor is the proposed rate; the very greatest profit possible is left to the ryot. It may be that the years in which the experiments were made in Balijora were exceptional years, the crops being very plentiful. In Datta Khoroi also the crops are abundant; and as I remarked in the case of the Jellamuta estate the profit left to the ryot in a fertile pergunnah, as compared with a less productive pergunnah, is not in exact proportion to the greater productiveness of the soil in the former over what it is in the latter; the profit increases far more than what the greater degree of productiveness would seem to warrant. In kismut Shipore, where the soil is the poorest of all, the profit left to the ryot is only Rs. 1-7-9, actually less than the average rate assessed, and yet here nearly all the ryots have accepted the new assessment. The clue to this is found in the following characteristic peculiar to the ryots of Hidgellee. They will agree to a nominal or a very moderate enhancement; where it is at all considerable they protest against it altogether. The rates in kismut Shipore have undergone an increase of two annas only, and this the ryots accept; in Majna Nyabad where a lower average rate has been assessed, and where the profits left to the ryot are considerable, not a single person has come forward to accept the assessment, because the enhancement in rates is great, and perhaps *prima facie* not warranted by the circumstances. The average increase in the rates for rice land in Majna Nyabad is nine annas. I would draw the attention of my superiors to one fact in connection with value of produce which would tend to confirm the validity of my assessment. I have throughout Hidgellee, save in Doro Dumnán, estimated the price of paddy to be 12 annas only per maund; it is now selling throughout the country for Rs. 2. There is no famine or even scarcity at present in Bengal, nor, so far as I know, is any to be apprehended in the future. For ought I know there is no great demand for rice in other parts of India either; yet the price of paddy has reached a higher point, I might almost say, than has ever been known in Hidgellee. I think it is most unlikely that the price will ever fall so low as 12 annas again; the opinion current amongst those who can speak with some degree of authority on the subject is that it will never again fall below Re. 1.

BUNKUR.

17. There is no revenue derived from woods or groves.

FISHERIES.

18. The revenue derived from fisheries assessed in six of the 11 pergunnahs of the estate is Rs 437-8, as compared with Rs. 788-12-7½, the figures of the former settlement. There is noticed a very great decrease in the revenue of the fisheries in two of the six pergunnahs, and this is due to the abandonment of the sea or Hooghly river fisheries.

RENT-ROLL.

19. The assets under each head are given in the statement (C) showing the former and present areas and jummas assessed thereon. The gross assets of 1845 were Rs. 1,84,124-5-4½; they have become Rs. 2,59,770-1-7. An increase of Rs. 75,645-12-2¾, or 41 per cent., has resulted. The proposed jumma is not *prima facie* excessive for 271,790b. 7c. 4b. 7g. of land. The causes of the increase in jumma are not far to seek. The estate is now perfectly protected from all damage by salt water inundations or excessive rainfall. The massive embankments erected and maintained by the Department Public Works along the sea-shore and along the larger tidal khalls inland effectually keep out salt water; the various sluices in these embankments afford an outlet for all superfluous rain water. The estate may suffer from drought, but as a whole it is safe from all inundation of any kind. In 1845, on the contrary, the protection afforded was of the most meagre kind, the sea-dyke was not high enough to keep out the sea water and the lands were periodically submerged. Since 1864, that is since the Hidgellee embankments were raised and strengthened, there has been no irruption of the sea into Hidgellee. Another cause for the increase in jumma of the estate, besides the increased productiveness of the soil, is increase in value of produce. As I write, paddy is actually selling in Hidgellee for so much as Rs. 2 a maund.

NUMBER OF INHABITANTS.

20. There are in the estate 32,489 men, 33,072 women, 17,735 boys under 12 years of age, 15,451 girls under 12 years of age. There are 18,106 cows, 431 buffaloes, 9,296 sheep, 4,603 goats, 278 horses and ponies, 26 asses, and 252 pigs. The Contai sub-divisional head-quarters are situated in the estate—where there is a Magistrate's court, a Moonsif's court, a police station, an Executive Engineer's office, and a Government aided school. There are everywhere patshalas in the estate where Bengali and Uriya are taught.

RESUMPTION OF RENT-FEE HOLDINGS.

21. No proceedings were taken in this re-settlement to resume rent-free holdings.

W. P. Price, Public Works
No. 977, Dec. 24, 1895

There are 9,967 petty, formerly resumed rent-free, holdings or tenures in the estate, assigned in the margin to the different pergunnahs to which they belong. They altogether cover an area of 60,521 <i>b</i> . 19 <i>c</i> . 13 <i>b</i> . 15 <i>g</i> . yielding a half rental of Rs. 25,252-8-7½. The former area was 61,361 <i>b</i> . 18 <i>c</i> . 12 <i>b</i> . 12 <i>g</i> . assessed in 1844 with a half rental assessment of Rs. 25,180-8-8. Some holdings show an increase in area, and others a decrease, which latter in the gross preponderates. The difference in the half rental is owing to the assessment in this re-settlement of land left un-	
Majnamuta ...	5,271
Doro Dumnun ...	3,028
Naruumuta ...	374
Kusba Hidgellee ...	178
Baliyora ...	312
Sarifabad ...	102
Kt. Pataspore ...	358
Kt. Shipore ...	122
Datta Khoroi ...	88
Amirabad ...	106
Majua Nyabad ...	28
	<u>9,967</u>
assessed, because uncultivated at the time of the last settlement.	

DIFFERENT CLASSES OF RYOTS.

22. There are three classes of ryots in the estate—khoddkhast, or resident ryots, 17,996 in number, who cultivate lands in the villages in which they reside; paikast, or non-resident, that is, who live in villages other than those the lands of which they cultivate, and who have been in occupation of their holdings for 12 years or more, 17,183 in number; both the aforesaid classes have rights of occupancy, the latter under the law; paikast ryots who have not held for 12 years, and who have acquired no rights of occupancy, 1,372 in number. With regard to the rights of occupancy ryots the law is clear from the time of the last settlement; also a fixed and settled status has been assigned to them. They cannot be ousted from their holdings even on account of an arrear of rent, except through the medium of the courts, nor can their rents be enhanced during the period of this re-settlement. They have a prescriptive right to sell or otherwise transfer their holdings; they can also cut down all trees growing in their holdings that may have been planted by themselves. As there is no timber in Hidgellee, nor indeed any large trees, the concession of this privilege does not mean much. I think, following the precedent of the Kalianpore settlement, which was confirmed by the Board by their letter noted in the margin,

No. 19A, dated 11th January 1875, to the address of the Commissioner, forwarded to me with his memorandum No. 648 of the 20th idem.

it also should be conceded to the non-occupancy ryots that their rents should not be enhanced during the term of this re-settlement; it is said that they can be ousted when an arrear accrues, but in case of dispute of the existence of such arrear, I think an ouster should be made only through the intervention of the civil courts. Non-occupancy ryots cannot cut down the trees growing in their holdings, but the alienation of their holdings has most certainly been practised by them since the last settlement. To all intents and purposes the paikast ryots of Hidgellee, who have not yet acquired rights of occupancy, and there are few such, are in quite as good a position as the khoddkhast and paikast occupancy ryots. The estate is under khas management, and perhaps this may be a reason for the zemindars not preferring any representations on the

subject of the rights of the ryots, but hitherto they have not thought proper to make any objections to the recognition of the status of the ryots as I have described above. The zemindars, of course, if they take settlement, will be bound to adhere to the jumma bundee or assessment of rates made by this Department; no capricious or fanciful departure from those rates will be allowed.

PUTWARIES.

23. The orders noted in the margin necessitate the appointment of putwaries in the estate. There were no putwaries in the last settlement. The number of these officials in the different pergunnahs is determined by their area and the number of ryots resident in them. The statement No. D will give details. I need here only state that 52 putwaries will be entertained at a cost of Rs. 3,120 throughout the estate.

Board's No. 610, dated 22nd November 1872, received with Commissioner's circular No. 167, dated 12th December 1872.

BARUAS.

Statement E exhibits the number of baruas or village headmen in the estate according to the terms of the last settlement, and the number proposed in this re-settlement. I am doubtful, however, that there is any necessity to entertain baruas in the estate who have given no assistance to the settlement officers—rather thrown every obstacle in their way by inducing the ryots to refuse the new assessment. The whole question

Vide this office letter No. 394 of the 29th March 1878, to the address of the Commissioner.

has formed the subject of report, and is now under the consideration of the Board of Revenue. The duties of village headmen, so far as the papers of the last settlement throw any light on the subject, seem to have been to prevent the illicit manufacture of salt, to report all offences committed within their respective villages to the police, to assist the Public Works Department officers in procuring coolies and materials, to assist the revenue officers at the time of settlement, and to act as a go-between to explain the rates assessed, &c., to the ryots. These duties they have in some cases systematically neglected; in most instances imperfectly performed, and there is no reason to believe that the estate would suffer if baruas were abolished altogether. In this place I will observe that there are 593* chowkidars in the estate paid Rs. 14,232* by the Magistrate of the district from the assignment from the revenue of the estate made in his favour by the Collector.

* NOTE.—These are for both Jellamuta and Majnamuta estates. Separate numbers cannot be given, the estates being so intermixed.

COLLECTION EXPENSES AND MALIKANA.

24. The orders noted in the margin remove all difficulty in deciding what would be fair and equitable proprietary and collection expenses for the proprietors in case they accept settlement. A consolidated

Vide clause 2, paragraph 10, section 9, chapter XX of the Board's rules.

allowance of 30 per cent. of the gross assets after all deductions have been made on account of putwaries' salary and other expenses will be granted to the proprietors, unless they prove recusant, when, according to the provisions of section 5 of Regulation VII of 1822, malikana will be calculated on the *net* amount realized by Government, *i.e.*, on the assets after deducting the consolidated allowances for farming profits and cost of collections. Tables C and C1 of statement No. XX

Vide column 5 of the first table.

will show what the Government revenue will amount to in either case, whether the proprietors prove recusant or agree to take settlement. The former revenue is shown in statement No. XX.

PARTIES ENTITLED TO SETTLEMENT.

25. The proprietors named in the margin, concerning whose

Baboo Ananda Lal Roy.

Srimati Satyabbama.

" Brahmamam.

" Rammohini

Debi.

Baboo Romesh Chunder,

Umesh Chunder, and Sarat

Chunder Mundal.

Baboo Joyanaran Giri.

status as such I think there can be no doubt, for they have always from the time of the acquisition of the country by the English, whether when invested with the management of their estate, or when out of possession, as at present, received malikana, were called upon to declare whether they would take settlement on the terms proposed in this report or not; also in case they considered the jumma assessed by this department excessive, what jumma they were inclined to agree to pay. Two of them have given separate answers, and what they say amounts to this—Rammohini Debi states that if it is at last found impracticable to enforce and realize the enhanced jumma assessed on the recusant ryots, she will be ready to take settlement on the former jumma of the recusant ryots, plus the present enhanced jumma assessed on the consenting ryots. That the usual malikana should be deducted from the total jumma to be arrived at in the manner indicated above. That the rate of collection expenses on account of the half rental assessment of the petty resumed rent-free tenures should not now be reduced from Rs. 15 to 10 per cent. Umesh Chunder, Romesh Chunder, and Sarat Chunder Mundal object principally to the proposed curtailment of their former allowances on account of malikana, collection expenses, and gramhbhery repairs, and of collection expenses on account of petty resumed rent-free tenures. They have no objections to urge against the retention of baruas and the introduction of the putwary system. They have no objection to take settlement at the enhanced jumma if it is agreed to by the ryots. The rest of the proprietors have applied for two months' extension of time to make up their minds, which request I have disallowed as already sufficient time had been given.

GRAMBHERIES.

26. It has been decided by the orders noted in the margin that the ryots are bound to construct and keep in proper condition the

grambheries or field embankments necessary for the cultivation of the estate. But the ryots decline unanimously to undertake this responsibility, principally on the ground that in the last settlement

Government order
No. 2578, dated 5th July
1872, to Board, received
with Commissioner's letter
No. 101, dated 16th May
1874.

as grambhery allowance in favour of the zemindars, who, however,

Majnamula.
Doo Dumman.
Naiumuta.
Bahjora.
Sarifabad.
Kismut Ataspoore.
Datta Khoroi.
Amirabad.

totally neglected the repairs of the village embankments, without which water cannot be retained in the rice fields and cultivation cannot be carried on. During the khas management of the estate by me I have proposed and been allowed year by year to spend a certain sum in repairing field embankments throughout the estate. It has been thought that whatever responsibilities lay on the zemindars according to the terms of the last settlement, Government, as in their place, was bound to accept these responsibilities when the estate came under khas management. As the ryots will not consent to repair grambheries, they will not accept pottahs by the terms of which this obligation is put upon them, consequently I have been unable to induce the ryots to take pottahs or to give kabuliyats.

DRAINAGE CHANNELS.

27. It is the duty of the zemindars also, in accordance with the orders cited above, to keep in proper repair all the interior drainage channels of the estate, Government undertaking to keep up the embankments described in schedule D, section 35 of Act VI (B.C.) of 1873, and to excavate the drainage channels lying outside the embankments and connected with the different sluices in those embankments. The zemindars, during the time they were managing their estate habitually neglected the interior drainage channels, and as they have given but a qualified assent to the conditions of the proposed re-settlement of their estate, no written agreements have been made with them, and consequently their obligations in this respect are still undefined, save by the Government order aforesaid. A list of all grambheries and interior drainage channels in the estate that the ryots and zemindars are respectively bound to maintain is annexed to the settlement proceedings.

TERM OF SETTLEMENT.

28. The term of this re-settlement will run till 1900 A.D., or 1307 A.S., the date fixed for all the settlements in the Burdwan Division.

J. C. PRICE,

Offg. Settlement Officer, Midnapore.

APPENDIX I.

Extract from "Notes on the History of the Hidgellee District, compiled from records transferred from the old Hidgellee Collectorate, to the office of the Collector of Midnapore, by J. C. PRICE, Officiating Settlement Officer of Midnapore."

THE earliest records connected exclusively with Hidgellee, which is now a sub-division of the Midnapore district, commence from the year 1786; but there are letters interspersed among the Midnapore records, from which it is ascertained that Hidgellee in 1771* was included in

* From Edward Baber to Mr. Lushington (probably), Resident at Hooghly, found among the Midnapore records of 1771

and

To William Hosen, Esq., Collector of Hooghly, from Samuel Lewis, dated Midnapore, 1st June 1773.

salt agency in that

From Warren Hastings, William Aldersey, P. M. Dacres, Thomas Lane, James Lawrell, H. Goodwin, John Graham, and William Lambert, to Mr. Edward Baber, Collector of Midnapore, dated Fort William, the 13th April 1773.

From George Vansittart, Superintendent, Khalsa, to Mr. Samuel Lewis, Collector of Midnapore, dated Fort William, the 2nd December 1773.

† From George Vansittart, Superintendent, Khalsa, to Mr. Samuel Lewis, Collector of Midnapore, dated Fort William, the 2nd December 1773.

‡ From Mr. Pearce (apparently), to Mr. James Dixon, Salt Agent to the Board of Trade, at Bircool, Midnapore, 11th July 1777.

§ From Alexander Higginson, William Marriott, William Pye, and Samuel Charters, to Mr. John Pearce at Midnapore, dated Burdwan, the 21st October 1777.

|| From Warren Hastings, P. Francis, Edward Wheler, and Eyre Coote, to Mr. John Pearce, Collector of Midnapore, dated Fort William, the 28th September 1780.

Hooghly. It did not at this time constitute a salt agency, under which designation its annals for a period of 51 years down to 1837 are found still preserved in the Midnapore Collectorate. The Hooghly Resident or Collector was charged apparently with the general administration of the Hidgellee district, but not with the provision of salt therefrom, for the first notice of the creation of a part of the country is found in the marginally noted letter by which the Collector of Midnapore was informed that Mr. Robert Reid was appointed agent to receive the salt on account of the Company from the zemindars of the district. And later in the year 1773, Mr. Vansittart, the Superintendent of the Khalsa, informed the Collector of Midnapore that Madan Gopal having been appointed to the charge of the districts of Hidgellee, Maisadul, &c., should he have occasion to apply for the Collector's assistance to prevent salt from being clandestinely conveyed away from those parts, or in any other respect to enable him to execute with success the trust which had been committed to him, the Collector was to grant it to him.†

In 1777‡ it was said that one Mr. James Dixon was the Salt Agent to the Board of Trade at Bircool. It appears that by October 1777§ Mr. Reid's business as Salt Agent was completed, and his allowances ceased from the month of Asin. It was not till 1780 that the creation of Hidgellee into an independent salt agency took place. The Government wrote—"|| Having resolved that the salt of the provinces shall be manufactured and disposed of for the immediate account of the Company, under the superintendence of a Comptroller and management of Provincial Agents, we herewith transmit for your information and guidance a copy of the plan adopted for these purposes. The gentleman whom

we have appointed to the office of Comptroller is Mr. Henry Vansittart, and the Agent stationed under him, for the several salt districts specified in the enclosed plan and lying within your Collectorship is Mr. Thomas Calvert, for part of the Hidgellee district, to whom you are required to afford every necessary assistance for the due execution of the trust reposed in him." A copy of the plan referred to will be found in the appendix; it will be sufficient in this place to state that the Hidgellee division comprised Jellamuta, Doro Dumnan, Sujamuta, Bircool, Sabang Mohur, Kakrachor, Nafri, Balshahi, Mirgoda, and Mainachora. Jellamuta and Doro Dumnan were two large estates comprised within 13 and 11 pergunnahs, respectively. Sujamuta was another estate conterminous with the pergunnah of that name. The other names are all those of pergunnahs save Nafri, spelt in the original Lamprey, which is not a pergunnah, but a village

From Thomas Calvert, Agent, Hidgellee division, to John Pearce, Esq., Collector of Midnapore, dated 29th November 1780.

the establishment of

From Warren Hastings, P. M., Dacres, and Edward Wheeler, to Mr. John Pearce, Collector of Midnapore, dated Fort William, the 14th November 1780.

wrote to the Comptroller of Salt—

From the Revenue Council consisting of Samuel Charters and Charles Croftes, to Mr. Henry Vansittart, Comptroller of Salt, dated Calcutta, the 17th November 1783.

inland chowkies, employed under the Collector of Midnapore for preventing the transportation of Mahratta salt through the western jungles, was placed under the orders of the Comptroller of the manufacture of salt, and of his subordinate, Mr. Calvert. In 1783 the Revenue Committee wrote to the Comptroller of Salt—"We see no objection to the districts in Jellasure being annexed to the division of the Salt Agent at Hidgellee, and have accordingly issued the necessary orders to the Collector of Midnapore for that purpose, and that he shall strike them out of the jumma of the province. Mr. Dynely is at present employed in farming the settlement of both the provinces of Midnapore and Jellasure, and we have directed him to furnish Mr. Calvert with an account, settlement and kistbundee, of the pergunnahs Bircool, Mirgoda, Balshahi, and Kakrachor. You will transmit to us the monthly accounts of the districts placed under Mr. Calvert in the same manner as those of the other districts paying revenue to your department." Accordingly, in December 1783, the districts of Bircool, Mirgoda, Balshahi, and Kakrachor, which, hitherto as part of the Jellasure Chakia in the Midnapore district, had been under the revenue administration of the Collector of Midnapore under the same circumstances as Sabang, Mohar, Mainachora, were annexed to the salt office, and placed under Mr. Calvert's management. The tehsildar was made acquainted with the transfer,

* From John Dynely, Superintendent, Collections, to Thomas Calvert, Esq., Salt Agent for district of Hidgellee, dated Midnapore, the 15th December 1783.

and the settlement and other necessary papers forwarded to him.* From a consideration of the nature of this accession to the duties of the Hidgellee Salt Agent, as well as of the meaning involved in the words "in the same manner as those of the other districts paying

revenue to your department," it is presumed that Mr. Calvert already exercised the functions of a Collector in those 25 pergunnahs which in 1771 were included in the Hooghly district, and which formed the territorial sub-division commonly known as

Majnamuta.
Doro Dumnan.
Narnamuta.
Bali-jora.
Iatta Khoroi.
Sarifabad.
Amirabad.
Kiamut Shipore.
Kusba Hidgellee.
Kiamut Pataspore.
Nyabad.
Jellamuta
Krinch.
Barnda Bazar.
Taraf Bisuan.

Gaomesh.
Kalindi Balshahi.
Bhograi.
Khalsi Bhograi.
Paharpore.
Nyabad Keoramal.
Bahirimuta.
Bhaiguih.
Dacanmal.
Sujamuta.
Bircool.
Urisa Balshahi.
Mirgoda.
Kakrachor.

the Hidgellee Chakla. It is ascertained beyond a doubt that from the year 1786, from which year the Hidgellee records are found preserved, the Salt Agent combined the provision of salt with the collection of the revenue in the 29 pergunnahs of his charge named in the margin. He was responsible for the provision of salt only in the saliferous tracts of the Mid-

napore Chakla, such as Sabang, Mainachora, and for the prevention of the illicit manufacture and transportation of salt in that chakla generally.

APPENDIX No. II.

Extract from Appendix No. III (geographical report on the Rivers and Embankments, District Midnapore, by MAJOR J. SCOTCE, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey) to report on the Revenue Survey operations of the Lower Provinces, from 1st October 1874 to 30th September 1875.

THE coast line which forms the southern boundary is well worthy of study. I will only describe its appearance without confidently expressing any theory as to the action which has been at work to cause its formation. This coast line is at the direct head of the Bay of Bengal, and receives the full force of the southerly winds which are prevalent during several months of the year. A peculiar range of sand hills extends at an average of six miles inland along this coast line; the ridge commences from the Hooghly river at the mouth of the Rasulpore river, it then trends inland from the present coast line until it reaches an extreme distance of seven miles, and finally falls back on the coast at the mouth of the Subarnrekha river.

On the east there is a single ridge about half a mile in breadth, the land south from the ridge towards the sea being a flat alluvial plain. In the centre and on the west there are several parallel ridges, alternating with strips of alluvial land. The face of the range inland is generally abrupt, about 60 feet in height, and overhanging a flat alluvial plain.

It would appear that this sand ridge must at one time have been the coast line, and that it was so for a considerable time is also evident from the elevation which the sand has attained. The same process is now going on on the present coast line, where a sand ridge is gradually being

raised by the action of the strong southerly wind during the hot months of the year. The sea must then have made in one part of the coast one long sudden recession, and in another part it seems to have receded by a succession of sudden steps. Again, the sea at one time evidently covered the plain north of the sand hills, but the cause is not apparent as to what new action suddenly occurred by which the sand ridge came to be thrown up. Was it that at one time there was not the strong southerly wind which is now so welcome in Lower Bengal, and that it suddenly sprung into existence after some great physical changes in Upper India?

The cause assigned for this strong sea wind is the rush to fill the vacuum which has been formed by the ascending of the heated air from the Gangetic plain. While the great valley of the Ganges was still in process of formation, the country would be swampy and partially tidal; there would then be over-heated atmosphere and no vacuum to be filled by a rush from the sea, but it is not apparent how the over-heating of the upper plains can have occurred suddenly. The elevated sand is largely occupied by the sites of villages and on the ridge the huts are usually found more scattered and more interspersed with gardens than when situated among the rice lands. The sand has a vegetation peculiarly its own, both in the cultivated crops and in the spontaneous growth of trees and flowering shrubs. This vegetation is more luxuriant and more purely tropical than is met with in the lower tracts, and this seems to be due to the large amount of moisture which is retained in the sand. Water melons are extensively cultivated and require no artificial irrigation. A description of almond tree, which bears its edible kernel in a peculiar way outside a luscious-looking but very acrid fruit, and which is said to be common in Western India, grows here in large numbers. Cocoanut and betel palms flourish well; ferns are found in great profusion in shady hollows, and among other flowering plants the bright scarlet exora, which grows freely in Ceylon and a purple azalea are the most common.

No. XX.—Abstract of information relative to the assessment of

1			2			3																
						UNASSESSED AREA.																
Extent in bighas.			Extent in acres.			Forest, jungle, and waste. <i>a.</i>		Site of village roads, tanks, and lands, otherwise incapable of cultivation. <i>b.</i>		Rent-free. <i>c.</i>		Service. <i>d.</i>										
II.—By last measure- ment ...			2,64,898	1	15	3	1,20,613	1	12	2,611	12	4	18	37,363	13	6	10	40,827	15	1	16
III.—By recent measure- ment ...			2,71,790	7	4	7	1,23,921	0	16	4,520	5	13	16	29,761	12	5	15	40,013	13	6	0

A.—Particulars of rent-free

NAMES OF HOLDERS.	DESCRIPTION OF		
	Devatra.	Brahmatra.	Piratra.
1	2	3	4
	21,412 9 10 15	13,787 17 6 10	2,262 16 4 5

B.—Occupation

Area and description of different kinds of soil recognized in the neighbourhood by marked distinctions.	Rate per bigha of each sort.	Bighas.	Acres.	Rent.	1285.
1	2	3	4	5	6
		B. C. B. G.	A. R. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Bastu (homestead)	1,273 18 8 10	680 1 17	5,068 12 0
Dhass (high land)	17,519 7 15	7,981 2 17	31,323 8 0
Total kalla	18,793 14 0 5	8,561 3 34	36,192 4 0
Jal	1,06,680 19 15 11	48,592 1 31	1,82,892 7 10
Total kalla and jal	1,25,454 13 15 16	57,154 1 25	2,19,084 11 10
Resumed rent-free lands declared to be mal owing to the neglect of the proprietors to come forward and take settlement.	1,842 5 9 5	839 1 7	2,723 5 4
Total	1,27,296 19 9 1	57,993 2 32	2,21,808 1 2
Culturable waste assessed with full rates.	4,836 19 11 5	2,203 2 19	2,987 9 7
Total	1,32,133 19 4 6	60,197 1 11	2,24,695 10 9	2,24,695 10 9
Culturable waste assessed with progressively increasing rates.	781 4 6 10	355 3 21	8 14 2	17 12 3
Total	1,32,915 3 10 16	60,553 0 32	2,24,704 8 11	2,24,713 7 0
Deduct to avoid fractions	4 6 8	4 6 8
Remainder	2,24,700 2 3	2,24,709 0 4
Peashuah	7,589 13 6
Jungleboores	3,202 16 13 0	1,459 0 21	1,112 1 14
Kumdurah	854 15 5 5	389 1 24	376 0 14
Total	4,057 12 2 5	1,848 2 6	9,077 14 84	9,077 14 84
Total mal	1,38,972 15 13 1	62,401 2 37	2,33,778 0 114	2,33,786 15 04
Juikur	437 8 0	437 8 0
Total	2,34,215 8 114	2,34,224 7 04
Half rental resumed rent-free.	60,521 19 15 15	27,572 2 1	35,252 8 74	35,252 8 74
Total	1,97,494 15 10 16	89,974 0 38	2,59,468 1 9	2,59,476 15 8

Estate Majnamuta, District Midnapore.

	4			5	6	7
	ASSET AREA.					
Total Columns a-d.	Cultivated and fallow.	Cultivable, not cultivated.	Total.	Former revenue.	Former rent-roll.	Former actual mo- tussil collections.
e.	a.	b.	c.			
				Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
80,863 0 13 4½	1,08,848 5 7 9½	9,611 0 4 17	1,94,095 1 1 18½	1,94,124 5 4½	1,16,378 2 8	.
74,295 11 9 11	1,91,876 11 9 1	5,618 4 1 15	1,97,494 15 10 16	

'ands from heading 3 (c).

REVENUES.		Mohattran.	Khoshbash.	Total.
Sannysattar.	Bairstabbattar.			
5	6	7	8	9
1 1 3 0	433 18 6 0	1,163 4 14	952 5 9 10	40,013 13 6 0

of Lands.

1286.	1287.	1288.	1289.	1290.	1291 to 1307.
7	8	9	10	11	12
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
2,24,695 10 9 26 10 5	2,24,695 10 9 74 6 5	2,24,695 10 9 122 2 5	2,24,695 10 9 192 10 3	2,24,695 10 9 263 2 2	2,24,695 10 9 510 14 2
2,24,722 5 2 4 6 8	2,24,770 1 2 4 6 8	2,24,817 13 2 4 6 8	2,24,888 5 0 4 6 8	2,24,958 12 11 4 6 8	2,25,006 8 11 4 6 8
2,24,717 14 6 ...	2,24,765 10 6 ...	2,24,813 6 6 ...	2,24,883 14 4 ...	2,24,954 6 2 ...	2,25,002 2 8 ...
9,077 14 8½	9,077 14 8½	9,077 14 8½	9,077 14 8½	9,077 14 8½	9,077 14 8½
2,33,795 13 2½ 437 8 0	2,33,843 9 2½ 437 8 0	2,33,891 5 2½ 437 8 0	2,33,961 13 0½ 437 8 0	2,34,032 4 11½ 437 8 0	2,34,080 0 11½ 437 8 0
2,34,233 5 2½ 25,252 8 7½	2,34,281 1 2½ 25,252 8 7½	2,31,323 13 2½ 25,252 8 7½	2,34,309 5 0½ 25,252 8 7½	2,34,469 12 11½ 25,252 8 7½	2,34,517 8 11½ 25,252 8 7½
2,59,465 13 10	2,59,533 9 10	2,59,581 5 10	2,59,651 13 3	2,59,722 5 7	2,59,770 1 7

C.—Analysis of

	1284.	1285.	1286.
1. Assets assumed as the basis of settlement ...	2,34,215 8 11½	2,34,224 7 0½	2,34,233 5 2½
2. Deduct barua allowance ...	Rs. A. P. 2,891 3 4½		
3. „ putwaries' salaries ...	3,120 0 0		
	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½
4. Remainder ...	2,28,202 5 7½	2,28,211 3 8½	2,28,220 1 10½
5. Deduct collection expenses and proprietary allowance at 30 per cent.	68,460 11 3½	68,463 5 11	68,466 0 5½
6. Remainder ...	1,59,741 10 4	1,59,747 13 9½	1,59,754 1 5
7. Add or } to avoid fractions ... {	0 5 8	0 2 2½ 0 1 5
8. Total or balance ...	1,59,742 0 0	1,59,748 0 0	1,59,754 0 0
9. Add half rental assessment on account of resumed rent-free lands ..	25,252 8 7½		
10. Deduct collection expenses at 10 per cent. ...	2,525 4 0		
11. Remainder ...	22,727 4 7½		
12. Deduct to avoid fractions ...	0 4 7½		
	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0
13. Total ...	1,82,469 0 0	1,82,475 0 0	1,82,481 0 0

C.—

	1284 A. S.	1285.	1286.
1. Assets assumed as the basis of settlement ...	2,34,215 8 11½	2,34,224 7 0½	2,34,233 5 2½
2. Deduct barua allowance ...	Rs. A. P. 2,893 3 4½		
3. „ putwaries' salaries ...	3,120 0 0		
	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½
4. Remainder ...	2,28,202 5 7½	2,28,211 3 8½	2,28,220 1 10½
5. Deduct collection expenses at 20 per cent. ...	45,640 7 6½	45,642 3 11½	45,644 0 4½
6. Remainder ...	1,82,561 14 1	1,82,568 15 9	1,82,576 1 6
7. Deduct proprietary allowance at 10 per cent. ...	18,256 3 0	18,256 14 4½	18,257 9 9
8. Remainder ...	1,64,305 11 1	1,64,312 1 4½	1,64,318 7 9
9. Add or } to avoid fractions ... {	0 4 11	0 1 4½	0 7 9
10. Total or balance ...	1,64,306 0 0	1,64,312 0 6	1,64,318 0 0
11. Add half rental assessment of resumed rent-free lands ..	25,252 8 7½		
12. Deduct collection expenses at 10 per cent. ...	2,525 4 0		
13. Remainder ...	22,727 4 7½		
14. Deduct to avoid fractions ...	0 4 7½		
	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0
Total ...	1,87,033 0 0	1,87,039 0 0	1,87,045 0 0

E.—Occupancy

Lands how occupied.	
1	
a. By proprietors	...
b. By cultivators having right of possession at fixed rates	...
c. By cultivators with a right of occupancy	...
d. By other cultivators	...
e. Cultivable, not cultivated land occupied by royas	...
Total	...

Revenue Assessed.

1287.	1288.	1289.	1290.	1291 to 1307.
2,34,281 1 2½	2,34,328 13 2½	2,34,399 5 0½	2,34,469 12 11½	2,34,517 8 11½
6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½
2,28,267 13 10¼ 68,480 5 7½	2,28,315 9 10¼ 68,494 10 10½	2,28,386 1 8¼ 68,515 13 3¼	2,28,456 9 7½ 68,536 15 7½	2,28,504 5 7½ 68,561 4 11
1,59,787 8 3 0 7 9	1,59,820 15 0 0 1 0	1,59,870 4 5 0 4 5	1,59,919 10 0 0 6 0	1,59,953 0 8½ 0 0 6½
1,59,788 0 0	1,59,821 0 0	1,59,870 0 0	1,59,920 0 0	1,59,953 0 0
22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0
1,82,515 0 0	1,82,548 0 0	1,82,597 0 0	1,82,647 0 0	1,82,690 0 0

1.

1287.	1288.	1289.	1290.	1291 to 1307, A. S.
2,34,281 1 2½	2,34,328 13 2½	2,34,399 5 0½	2,34,469 12 11½	2,34,517 8 11½
6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½	6,013 3 4½
2,28,267 13 10¼ 45,653 9 2½	2,28,315 9 10¼ 45,653 3 0½	2,28,386 1 8¼ 45,677 3 7½	2,28,456 9 7½ 45,691 5 2½	2,28,504 5 7½ 45,700 14 0½
1,82,614 4 8 14,261 6 10½	1,82,652 7 10 14,265 4 0	1,82,708 14 1 18,270 14 3	1,82,765 4 5 18,276 8 6	1,82,803 7 7 18,280 5 7
1,64,352 13 9½ 0 2 2½	1,64,397 3 10 0 3 10	1,64,437 15 10 0 0 2	1,64,488 11 11 0 4 1	1,64,523 2 0 0 2 0
1,64,353 0 0	1,64,397 0 0	1,64,438 0 0	1,64,489 0 0	1,64,523 0 0
22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0	22,727 0 0
1,87,080 0 0	1,87,114 0 0	1,87,165 0 0	1,87,216 0 0	1,87,260 0 0

Rights.

Area.	Rent.	REMARKS.
2	3	4
1,102 17 3 10	1,828 8 11	
4,057 12 2 1	1,488 1 3	
1,06,783 1 1 15	1,83,330 0 1	
19,401 1 4 0	35,653 1 1	
5,618 4 1 15	3,198 8 5	
1,36,972 15 13 1	2,26,508 9 9	

J. C. PRICE,
Offy. Settlement Officer.

A—continued.

DESCRIP- TION OF LAND.	PRESENT AND PROPOSED RATES IN THE UNDERMENTIONED PERGUNNAHS OF THE MAJNAMUTA ESTATE.											
	Mejna Nyabad.			Naruanuta.			Kismut Pataspore.			Datta Khorol.		
	Present.		Proposed.	Present.		Proposed.	Present.		Proposed.	Present.		Proposed.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Kismut Shipore. Present. Proposed.
Eastu ...	3 3 2½, 2 11 10, 2 11 8½, 2 8 6½	4 0 0, 3 8 0.	3 0 0 to 0 10 0	3 3 2½, 2 4 0, 2 2 1, 2 2 0.	3 3 2½, 2 4 0, 2 2 1, 2 2 0.	3 4 0.	2 10 8, 2 2 1½, 1 5 4, 1 1 0½.	2 10 8, 2 2 1½, 1 5 4, 1 1 0½.	4 0 0, 3 0 0.	4 4 0	4 4 0	4 6 0
Dhasa ...	1 9 0, 1 8 6½, 1 7 5½, 1 3 2½	1 12 0, 1 10 0.	2 8 0 to 0 6 0	1 13 10½, 1 13 10, 1 7 0, 1 5 4, 1 5 0.	1 13 10½, 1 13 10, 1 7 0, 1 5 4, 1 5 0.	2 0 0, 1 8 0.	1 13 10½, 1 9 7½, 1 1 0½, 0 12 9½	1 13 10½, 1 9 7½, 1 1 0½, 0 12 9½	2 4 0, 2 0 1, 1 14 0, 1 12 0.	2 8 0, 2 7 0, 2 6 0.	2 8 0, 2 7 0, 2 6 0.	2 10 0 2 8 0
Jal ...	1 0 0, 0 14 11½, 0 14 11, 0 14 4½, 0 13 10½	1 10 0, 1 9 0, 1 8 0.	1 12 0 to 0 6 0	1 2 6½, 1 2 6½, 1 2 0, 1 1 9½, 0 15 0, 0 14 0, 0 13 0, 0 12 4.	1 2 6½, 1 2 6½, 1 2 0, 1 1 9½, 0 15 0, 0 14 0, 0 13 0, 0 12 4.	1 9 0, 1 7 0, 1 6 0, 1 5 0, 1 0 0.	1 6 4½, 1 5 4, 1 1 0½, 0 12 9½, 0 10 8, 0 9 7½	1 6 4½, 1 5 4, 1 1 0½, 0 12 9½, 0 10 8, 0 9 7½	1 12 0, 1 11 0, 1 9 0, 1 8 0, 1 7 0, 1 6 0.	1 9 6, 0 13 0, 0 8 0.	1 9 6, 0 13 0, 0 8 0.	1 11 0 1 6 0

A—continued.

DESCRIP- TION OF LAND.	RATES PREVAILING IN THE NEIGHBOURING PERMANENTLY-SETTLED PERGUNNAH OF—						RATES PROPOSED FOR THE NEIGHBOURING PER- GUNNAHS OF THE TEMPORARILY-SETTLED ESIATE, JELLANUTA.				Rates pre- vailing in another temporarily- settled pergunnah Patasapore.
	Shipore.	Ekra.	Pratapbhan.	Sujanu- ta.	Bhunia- muta.	Bajer- pore.	Pahar- pore.	Khalna Bhograi.	Kalinadi Halsinahi.	Tarat Erinch.	
Bastu ...	Rs. A. P. 15 0 0 to 1 10 0.	Rs. A. P. 20 0 0, 11 4 0, 4 0 0.	Rs. A. P. 15 0 0.	Rs. A. P. 16 12 0 to 3 9 0	Rs. A. P. 7 0 0 to 0 4 0.	Rs. A. P. 5 5 4.	Rs. A. P. 3 0 0, 2 11 0, 2 0 0.	Rs. A. P. 5 0 0, 4 8 0, 4 2 0, 4 0 0, 3 8 0.	Rs. A. P. 5 0 0, 4 12 0, 4 2 0, 4 0 0, 3 8 0.	Rs. A. P. 5 0 0, 4 8 0, 3 0 0, 2 9 0.	Rs. A. P. 8 0 0, 7 7 9.
Dhasa ...	2 0. These are the rates of the villages immediately adjoining the pergunnah under re-settlement called kismut Shipore; higher rates are found elsewhere in the pergunnah.	4 0 0, 3 8 0, 3 0 0, 2 8 0.	3 0 0, 2 8 0, 2 0 0, 1 14 0, 1 8 0, 1 4 0.	3 4 8 to 2 15 6.	13 0 6 to 1 0 4.	4 4 3, 3 7 2, 1 13 10.	2 0 0, 1 14 0, 1 4 0.	3 0 0, 2 12 0, 2 8 0, 2 6 0, 2 4 0, 1 12 0, 1 8 0, 1 12 0, 1 0 0, 0 8 0.	3 0 0, 2 12 0, 2 8 0, 2 6 0, 2 4 0, 1 12 0, 1 8 0, 1 12 0, 1 0 0, 0 8 0.	2 8 0, 2 4 0, 2 2 0, 1 12 0, 1 13 0, 1 8 0, 1 6 0, 1 2 0, 1 0 0.	4 4 8, 3 11 9, 2 10 9, 1 9 6, 1 1 0.
Jal ...	1 11 0, 1 10 0, 1 7 0. Same remark as above applies.	1 12 0, 1 10 0, 1 8 0, 1 6 0.	1 14 0, 1 12 0, 1 0 0, 1 8 0.	2 11 0 to 2 7 3.	2 14 0 to 1 9 7.	2 6 4, 1 13 10.	1 11 0, 1 10 0, 1 9 0, 1 8 0, 1 5 0, 0 12 0.	2 4 0, 2 4 0, 1 14 0, 1 12 0, 1 8 0, 1 6 0, 1 2 0, 1 0 0, 0 15 0.	2 4 0, 2 4 0, 1 14 0, 1 12 0, 1 8 0, 1 6 0, 1 2 0, 1 0 0, 1 4 0, 1 0 0.	2 2 0, 2 0 0, 1 15 0, 1 13 0, 1 13 0, 1 9 0, 1 6 0, 1 2 0, 1 0 0, 0 10 0.	2 10 6, 2 6 6, 1 14 0, 1 13 9, 1 9 9, 1 7 6, 1 5 6.

These are the rates of the villages immediately adjoining the pergunnahs under re-settlement called Majnamuta and Sarlabad.

These are the rates of the villages immediately adjoining the pergunnah under re-settlement called kismut Shipore and Datta Khoroi.

A—concluded.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	PRESENT AND PROPOSED RATES OF PERGUNNAH KUSBA HIDGELLES OF THE MAJNAMUTA ESTATE.								Rates proposed for the neighbouring pergunnah taraf Bisuan of the temporarily-settled estate Jellamuta.			
	Present.				Proposed.							
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Bastu ...	3 8 0,	3 0 0,	2 14 0,		3 8 0,	2 8 0,	1 0 0.		4 12 0,	4 11 0,	4 10 0,	
	2 12 0,	2 10 0,	2 8 6,						4 8 0,	4 6 0,	4 4 0,	
	2 6 0,	2 4 0,	2 2 0,						4 0 0,	3 12 0,	3 8 0,	
	1 14 0.								3 0 0,	2 11 0.		
Dhasa ...	1 12 0,	1 10 0,	1 8 0,		2 0 0,	1 15 0,	1 12 0,		3 4 0,	3 2 0,	3 0 0,	
	1 6 0,	1 5 0,	1 3 0,		1 8 0,	1 4 0,	1 0 0,		2 14 0,	2 12 0,	2 10 0,	
	1 2 0,	1 1 0,	1 0 0,		0 12 0,	0 10 0,	0 8 0,		2 8 0,	2 6 0,	2 4 0,	
	0 14 0,	0 12 0,	0 10 0.		0 4 0,	0 3 0.			2 2 0,	2 1 0,	2 0 0,	
									1 15 0,	1 14 0,	1 12 0,	
									1 10 0,	1 8 0,	1 2 0,	
									0 10 0.			
Jal ...	1 6 0,	1 5 0,	1 4 0,		2 0 0,	1 14 0,	1 12 0,		2 2 0,	2 1 0,	2 0 0,	
	1 1 0,	1 0 0,	0 15 0,		1 8 0,	0 10 0,	0 7 0.		1 15 0,	1 14 0,	1 13 6,	
	0 13 0,	0 12 0,	0 9 0,						1 13 0,	1 12 6,	1 12 0,	
	0 6 0.								1 11 0,	1 10 0,	1 9 0,	
									1 8 0,	1 7 6,	1 6 0,	
									1 5 0,	0 10 0,	0 8 0.	

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	PRESENT AND PROPOSED RATES OF PERGUNNAH DOBO DUMMAN OF THE MAJNAMUTA ESTATE.						RATES PREVAILING IN THE NEIGHBOURING PERMANENTLY-SETTLED PERGUNNAH OF—			
	Present.			Proposed.			Maisadul.		Kasimnagar.	
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Bastu	3 12 10,	3 12 0,	2 8 0,	4 2 0,	4 1 0,		There are no special rates assessed for bastu and dhasa lands.			
	2 2 1.			4 0 0.						
Dhasa	1 6 3,	1 6 0,	1 5 4,	1 12 0,	1 11 0,		2 5 0 to 1 1 0			
	1 5 0,	1 4 3,	1 4 0,	1 10 0,	1 8 0,					
	1 3 0,	1 2 0,	0 14 0,	1 4 0,	1 0 0.					
	0 12 2,	0 12 0,	0 10 0.							
Jal	1 12 10,	1 12 0,	1 11 9,	2 8 0,	2 4 0,					
	1 11 0,	1 10 8,	1 10 0,	2 2 0,	2 1 0,					
	1 9 7,	1 9 0,	1 8 10,	2 0 0,	1 14 0,					
	1 8 0,	1 7 0,	1 7 6,	1 12 0,	1 8 0,					
	1 7 0,	1 6 8,	1 6 0,	1 4 0,	1 0 0.					
	1 5 0,	1 4 0,	1 3 6,							
	1 3 0,	1 2 0,	1 0 0,							
	0 10 0.									

B.

Statement of produce in connection with the proposed re-settlement of the Majnamuta Estate.

	NAMES OF PER-GUNNAHS.	Average outturn of produce per bigha, ascertained in maunds of paddy.	Average price per maund of paddy.	Total value of the produce including straw.	Deduct expenses of cultivation.	Deduct proposed average rate of rent.	Total deduction.	Balance left to the ryot as net profit.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		Mds. s. c	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1	Majnamutan ...	8 31 4	0 12 0	7 1 4	(a) 2 8 0	1 11 0	4 3 0	2 14 4
2	Doro Dumnun ...	7 32 0	1 4 0	9 4 9	(b) 5 0 0	2 2 0	7 2 0	2 2 9
3	Naruumuta*	1 6 6
4	Kusba Hidgellee ...	9 20 0	0 12 0	7 11 0	(c) 3 6 0	1 14 0	5 4 0	2 7 0
5	Balijora ...	10 31 0	0 12 0	8 5 0	2 8 0	1 11 0	4 3 0	4 2 0
6	Sarfabad ...	8 29 0	0 12 0	7 0 9	2 8 0	1 12 5	4 3 5	2 13 4
7	Kismut Pataspore...	8 3 8	0 12 0	6 9 0	2 8 0	1 5 6	3 13 6	2 11 6
8	Shipore ...	6 36 0	0 12 0	5 10 9	2 8 0	1 11 0	4 3 0	1 7 9
9	Datta Khoroi ...	9 20 0	0 12 0	7 10 0	2 8 0	1 9 6	4 1 6	3 8 4
10	Amirabad ...	8 32 0	0 12 0	6 13 0	2 8 0	1 12 3	4 4 3	2 8 9
11	Majna Nyabad ...	8 20 0	0 12 0	6 14 0	2 8 0	1 9 0	4 1 0	2 13 0

Statement of produce in connection with the former settlement of the Majnamuta Estate.

1	Majnamuta†
2	Doro Dumnun	...	6 20 0	0 8 4	4 6 0	1 11 2	1 10 0	3 5 2
3	Naruumuta†
4	Kusba Hidgellee	...	7 0 0	0 7 0	3 8 0	1 0 0	1 5 0	2 5 0
5	Balijora†
6	Sarfabad†
7	Kismut Pataspore†
8	Shipore†
9	Datta Khoroi	...	5 30 0	0 6 0	3 6 0	1 5 0	1 4 0	2 9 0
10	Amirabad†
11	Majna Nyabad†

* No experiment was made in Naruumuta; the rates were fixed by comparison with those prevailing in the neighbouring pergunnahs.

† No figures are given in the papers of the former settlement of these pergunnahs.

	Rs. A. P.
(a) 16 Seers of seed paddy	0 5 0
7 Ploughs at 1½ annas each	0 10 6
2 Coolies to prepare the land for the seed	0 3 0
5 Do. for transplanting at one and a half anna each	0 7 6
4 Coolies for reaping	0 6 0
2 Do. for carrying the paddy home	0 3 0
2 Do. for threshing	0 3 0
Wear and tear of implements	0 2 0
Total	2 8 0
(b) 5 Ploughs	1 7 6
10 Seers of seed paddy	0 5 0
4 Coolies for transplanting	0 12 0
2 Do. for weeding	0 6 0
Contract rate for reaping and stacking paddy	1 0 0
3 Coolies for threshing paddy	0 9 0
Wear and tear of implements	0 8 6
Total	5 0 0
(c) 16 Seers of seed paddy	0 6 6
6 Ploughs at 2½ annas each	0 15 0
1 Coolie to prepare the land for the seed	0 2 0
4 Coolies for transplanting	0 8 0
2 Do. for weeding	0 4 0
4 Do. for reaping	0 8 0
2 Do. for bringing the paddy home	0 4 0
3 Do. for threshing	0 4 0
Wear and tear of implements...	0 2 6
Total	3 6 0

C.

Statement showing the former and present areas, and the jummas assessed thereon in the Majnamuta Estate.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	IN THE FORMER SETTLEMENT.		IN THE PRESENT RE-SETTLEMENT.	
	Quantity of land.	Jumma.	Quantity of land.	Jumma.
	B. C. B. G.	Rs. A. P.	B. C. B. G.	Rs. A. P.
Bastu (homestead) ...	741 5 1 10	2,796 6 0½	1,273 18 8 10	5,068 12 0
Dhasa (high land) ...	10,963 12 8 12	16,162 2 4½	17,519 15 7 15	31,123 8 0
Total kula ...	11,704 17 10 2	18,958 8 5	18,798 14 0 5	36,192 4 0
Jal ...	76,657 12 2 1½	1,11,429 4 7½	1,06,660 19 15 11	1,82,892 7 10
Total kula and jal ...	88,362 9 12 3½	1,30,387 13 0½	1,25,454 13 15 16	2,19,084 11 10
Resumed rent-free lands declared to be mal (revenue-paying) owing to the neglect of the proprietors to come forward and take settlement ...	2,845 11 5 6	1,399 12 0½	* 1,842 5 9 5	2,723 5 4
Total ...	91,208 1 1 9½	1,31,787 9 0½	1,27,296 19 9 1	2,21,808 1 2
Assessed culturable waste ...	9,611 0 4 17	7,548 13 6½	5,618 4 1 15	3,198 7 9
Total ...	1,00,819 1 6 6½	1,39,336 6 7½	1,32,915 3 10 16	2,25,006 8 11
Unassessed culturable waste ...	2,611 12 4 1½	...	4,520 5 13 16
" unculturable " ...	37,363 13 6 10½	" ...	29,761 12 5 15
Total unassessed ...	39,975 5 11 8½	" ...	34,281 18 3 11
Total ...	1,40,794 7 1 15	1,39,336 6 7½	1,67,197 1 14 7	2,25,006 8 11
Add the former mal area and jumma assessed thereon in pergunnah Narumuta ...	17,640 4 6 0	9,892 5 9
Total ...	1,58,434 11 7 15	1,49,228 12 4½
Deduct to avoid fractions	4 6 8
Remainder	2,25,002 2 3
Junglebooree ...	3,306 9 9 0	1,144 5 5½	3,202 16 13 0	† 1,112 1 1½
Confirmed kumdurah ...	967 7 0 0	373 6 2½	854 15 5 5	‡ 376 0 1½
Total ...	1,62,708 8 0 15	1,50,746 7 11½	1,71,254 14 0 12	2,26,490 3 5½
Peshkush	§ 7,408 8 1	7,589 13 6
Total	1,58,155 0 0½	2,34,080 0 11½
Julkur	788 12 7½	437 8 0
Total mal ...	1,62,708 8 0 15	1,58,943 12 8½	1,71,254 14 0 12	2,34,517 8 11½
Half-rental resumed rent-free ...	61,361 18 12 12	25,180 8 8	60,521 19 13 15	25,252 8 7½
Total ...	2,24,070 6 13 7	• 1,84,124 5 4½	2,31,776 13 14 7	2,59,770 1 7
Confirmed rent-free ...	40,827 15 1 16	40,018 13 6 0
Total ...	2,64,898 1 15 3	2,71,790 7 4 7

* This may not be a real decrease. In the case of pergunnah Kusba Hidgellee (as in pergunnah Jellamuta of the Jellamuta estate) such lands have not been separately assessed and shown in the present re-settlement papers, but they have been amalgamated with the mal area. They are, however, included in 2,845b. 11c. 5b. and 6gds. extracted from the last settlement papers.

† The holder of a junglebooree tenure covered with dense jungle lying on the banks of the river Hooghly having relinquished his lease, the lands were amalgamated with the mal area assessed with full rates, and of course transferred to another head. There has therefore resulted a decrease in the former jumma under head "junglebooree."

‡ The lands comprised in a confirmed kumdurah holding were found to have greatly increased in the present remeasurement. The excess lands have been assessed with the former kumdurah rates, hence the change in jumma.

§ These are the figures of the last settlement, but they are incorrect.

D.

*Statement of Establishment of Putwaries proposed to be entertained
in the Majnamuta Estate.*

No.	Names of pergunnahs.	Number of putwaries.	Rate of salary.	Amount of annual remuneration.	REMARKS.
1	2	3	4	5	6
			Rs.	Rs.	
1	Majnamuta	20	5	1,200	
2	Doro Dumnun	15	5	900	
3	Naruamuta	5	5	25	
4	Kusba Hidgellee	3	5	180	
5	Balijora	2	6	144	
6	Sarifabad	1	5	60	
7	Kismut Pataspore	2	6	120	
8	Shipore	1	4	48	
9	Datta Khoroi	1	5	60	
10	Amirabad	1	5	60	
11	Majna Nyabad	1	5	60	
	Total ...	52		3,120	

E.

Statement of Establishment of Baruas in the Majnamuta Estate.

No.	Names of Pergunnahs.	PRESENT		PROPOSED		REMARKS.
		Number.	Amount of remuneration.	Number.	Amount of remuneration.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	
1	Majnamuta	228	866 14 9	252	1,249 5 9	
2	Doro Dumnun	100	785 13 11½	100	785 13 11½	
3	Naruamuta	24	179 3 0	24	179 3 0	
4	Kusba Hidgellee	23	108 4 4	24	135 0 0	
5	Balijora	24	87 9 5	24	149 14 0	
6	Sarifabad	19	43 6 0	19	57 3 3	
7	Kismut Pataspore	11	90 10 0	12	173 3 0	
8	Shipore	5	31 5 3½	5	38 1 2	
9	Datta Khoroi	11	66 0 0	11	66 0 0	
10	Amirabad	7	42 0 0	6	33 10 0	
11	Majna Nyabad	6	15 7 9½	7	25 13 3	
	Total ...	458	2,316 10 6½	484	2,893 3 4½	

J. C. PRICE,

Offg. Settlement Officer.

No. 468A, dated Fort William, the 2nd July 1878.

From—H. L. HARRISON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L.P.,
To—The Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Revenue Department.

I AM desired to submit the following preliminary report on the proceedings connected with the settlement of the large temporarily-settled Majnamuta estate in the Midnapore district.

2. This report embraces the completion of all proceedings as far as the *tenants* of the estate are concerned, and contains such information only as bears upon those proceedings. After these have been confirmed or modified, it will remain to fix the amount of land revenue to be assessed on the estate, and to offer the settlement to the proprietors on those terms. Until the rents payable by the ryots, and similar preliminaries, such as are dealt with in this report, are finally determined, it would be premature to attempt to make any arrangement with the proprietors, as such arrangement would be liable to be disturbed by any modification introduced into the details: and, as a fact, the zemindars would never think of accepting settlement until the precise objections of the ryots have been determined and made legally binding on them.

3. The estate contains 11 pergunnahs, very unequal in size and importance, and the Settlement Officer, following the principle adopted at the time of the former settlement of the estate in 1845, has treated, for the purposes of his reports, each pergunnah separately, not as a separate estate, but as an integral portion of the main estate. The Commissioner has compressed them into a single report, and the Board propose to adopt this course, so far as the general part of their report is concerned; comparing, however, separately for each pergunnah the rates now proposed with those that were fixed at the last settlement. In the general review of the main points, the Board have made free use of the remarks with which the Commissioner has submitted the Settlement Officer's pergunnah reports.

4. *Geographical position of Majnamuta.*—The 11 pergunnahs of Majnamuta are all situated in Hidgellee, are therefore only a few feet above mean sea level, and, were they not embanked, would be exposed to inundations of salt water every high spring-tide. Hidgellee is bounded on the east by the river Hooghly where it widens into the Bay of Bengal. The course of the river, after describing a semi-circle at Diamond Harbour, is nearly due south, and two tidal navigable rivers flow into it nearly at right angles—the Huldee and the Bagda or Rasulpore. At the time of the last settlement, the trade of Hidgellee depended on these rivers. The Huldee, flowing on a high bed, is scarcely navigable at low water, but the Rasulpore, with a much lower bed, is an excellent artery of communication, and throws out numerous branches on either side, up which heavily laden boats can penetrate at high tide. Hence intercommunication with Calcutta is available within a few miles of almost every village of Hidgellee; and the trade of the country has for years consisted of the exportation to Calcutta of its surplus paddy, and the importation in return of tobacco, salt (since the cessation of the salt manufacture in 1863), English cloth, spices, and firewood, in which the whole tract is *very* deficient.

This trade during the last eight years has been much developed by the opening of the tidal canal, which, starting from Kalinuggur on

the Rasulpore about 10 miles from its junction with the Hooghly, goes due north and nearly parallel to the Hooghly as far as the Huldee, which it crosses at about the same distance from its mouth, and then opens into the Hooghly at Gewkhally at the commencement of the Diamond Harbour semi-circle, and just where the Roopnarayan and Hooghly join. The canal greatly shortens the distance, but it is chiefly resorted to on account of the dangers of the Hooghly navigation, where it is almost as exposed as the open sea. Fleets of rice boats have often been caught in sudden storms in the Hooghly (especially in March and April and wrecked, and in spite, therefore, of their having to pay tolls, the canal obtains all the traffic in these months, and the bulk of it at all seasons of the year. Thus improved communications alone have added something to the value of produce in Hidgellee.

5. The Majnamuta estate is composed of two parts—one consisting of the large pergunnah of Doro Dumnán, which contains about one-third of the entire estate, and the other consisting of Majnamuta (which contains another one-third), and the remaining nine pergunnahs grouped round it, which together are not quite as large as Majnamuta or Doro Dumnán alone.

6. Doro Dumnán is the name which is given to that part of the country round which the Hooghly at Diamond Harbour curves. Its 'coast' line extends from the Huldee to within about six miles of Gewkhally at the canal head. It has, therefore, exceptional advantages in the way of trade, which enable the ryots to get an unquestionably higher price for their produce than those of the remaining pergunnahs. The river at that point is considered safe, and heavily laden boats can float up to Calcutta by tidal action alone. Hence prices in Doro Dumnán are almost invariably higher than in any other part of the Midnapore district.

Its situation tends still more to favour the trade in straw. This bulky article cannot be exported at all if the distance is great; and, as a fact, no other pergunnah of Majnamuta has any appreciable export trade in straw, the value therefore is regulated by the local demand. In Doro Dumnán, however, the straw trade with Calcutta is very active; the high steeple-shaped stacks that are erected all along the river bank, after the *amun* rice has been harvested, are a conspicuous feature in the country, and these, transferred to the large unwieldy boats that are the dread of ships and steamers anchored in the river, are floated up for sale in Calcutta.

7. No other pergunnah of Majnamuta reaches to the Huldee. At the mouth of the Rasulpore,* on the north side lies Kusba Hidgellee, and on the south Balijora. The former, which is virtually an island, surrounded by the Hooghly, the Rasulpore, and the Koonjopore khall, has some advantage over the other pergunnahs in a shorter river route, so far as its trade trusts this precarious mode of transport; but if it resorts to the canal, it has to go back to the commencement at Kalinagar. Hence, as a whole, and for all practical purposes, almost the same prices apply to all the pergunnahs except Doro Dumnán.

8. Naruamuta and kismut Pataspore are outside the Bagda-Rasulpore higher up, and all the other pergunnahs are south and west

* This river is called Rasulpore below the junction with the Serpai and Bagda above it.

of that river. Majnamuta extends from the sea coast south of Contai at the south-east to near Balighai at the head of the Bagda to the north-west, and Balijora, Amirabad, Majna Nyabad, Datta Khoroi, kismut Shipore, and Sarifabad lie all round it or intermixed with it, forming substantially one block with it.

9. *History of Estate.*—In tracing the history of the estate, it is perhaps unnecessary to go further back than the year 1765 A.D., when the Hon'ble East India Company came into possession of the estate on the acquisition of the Dewanny. In that year Jadab Ram Roy was the proprietor; he died in 1780, leaving a son, Kuarnaryan Roy, and three daughters, viz., Bishunpriya, Haripriya, and Kuchalmoni. Kuarnaryan succeeded his father in 1781, and died in 1782, leaving a minor son, Joynaryan Roy, who died the following year, leaving a widow, who adopted Sunder Naryan Roy as her heir. The succession then devolved on Joynaryan's step-mother, Ranee Sugandha Deyi, who refused a permanent settlement of the estate which was offered her in 1793. Khas management followed till the Ranee's death in 1803, when Sunder Naryan Roy, the adopted son of Joynaryan Roy, succeeded her. This succession was opposed by Jadub Ram Roy's six grandsons (sons of his three daughters abovenamed), and the Sudder Dewanny Adawlut decreed the case in their favour. Passing over the many changes in the ownership of the estate, resulting from death, sales of shares for debt, and the like, it was regularly settled in 1845; but in spite of this in 1851 the proprietors committed default and the estate was taken out of their hands and given in farm for a term extending to 1866. On the expiration of this term, a summary settlement was made with the proprietors for 1867-68 on substantially the same terms as in 1845, followed by a renewal for five years till 1872, which again was extended from 1873 till such time as a regular measurement and re-settlement of the estate could be made. The present shareholders claim, either by descent or purchase, from the grandsons of Jadab Ram. One of these died, and his share was inherited by three others, who thus hold $\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4}$ of $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{4}$. The present incumbents of these shares are Baboo Anandlall Roy, the head of the family, and two ladies, Srimutti Brohmomohi and Srimutti Satyabhama. The other two shares have passed out of the family, one of them still consisting of $\frac{1}{8}$ th is held by Srimutti Rammohini Debi, and the other divided into two equal portions, $\frac{1}{16}$ th each, is held by Baboos Brindabun Chunder Mundul and Joynarain Giri.

10. *Present position of the Estate.*—The estate is thus still held in six separate, though no longer equal, shares, for each of which separate accounts have been opened under section 10, Act XI of 1859. During the pendency of the present settlement proceedings all the shareholders defaulted in January 1875, and the estate was brought under khas management for five years from 9th February 1875, under the provisions of section 4, Regulation IX of 1825. The default which led to khas management cannot be said to have necessarily resulted from over-assessment, but was rather due to the disputes of the shareholders, to the incapacity of most of them to manage their affairs, and to the organized opposition of the ryots. The collections, since the estate has been under khas management, have sufficed to pay all the expenses of management, and at the same time

rapidly to reduce the arrears of revenue, till they have by this time been very nearly liquidated. This has been done, however, without taking any rent from the proprietors for their nijjote lands, such claims having been allowed to be set off against their malikana.

11. *Measurement.*—The Commissioner writes under this head as follows—

The measurements have been made carefully and in accordance with the rules. It was generally cadastral or field by field, but in some cases in which large plots of unculturable waste or jungle were found, the measurement was mehalwari. The area was first computed in standard bighas and then reduced to local bighas to admit of the application of local rates. The local bigha is considerably larger than the standard bigha, containing as it does 19,845 square feet, against 14,400 square feet, the measurement of the former. The local standard pole is 7 feet 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, 20 of which by 16 make a local bigha; hence an English acre is equal to bighas 2-3-14 of the local measurement. In Doro Dumnán the ryots strongly objected at the commencement to the lands being measured according to the English standard; but their objection was overruled.* * * * In Kusba Hidgellee the almost total absence of field embankments, raised with the view of marking the boundaries of holdings of different ryots, gave rise to frequent disputes regarding field boundaries, and Mr. Price mentions a peculiar mode of settlement of such disputes out of court.* * * * The accuracy of the measurements in all the pergunnahs has been generally admitted by the ryots, almost all of whom have signed the measurement papers.

The table below shows the total area of the estate in local bighas, pergunnah by pergunnah, as ascertained in the present and former settlement, the area assessed and that left out of assessment—

	PRESENT SETTLEMENT AREA IN LOCAL BIGHAS.			FORMER SETTLEMENT AREA IN LOCAL BIGHAS.			PERCENTAGE OF—		
	Assessed, including resumed rent-free.	Unassessed, including rent-free.	Total.	Assessed, including resumed rent-free.	Unassessed, including rent-free.	Total.	Increase of total area, column 1 on column 7.	Increase of assessed area, column 2 on column 5.	Decrease of unassessed area, column 6 on column 3.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Majnamuta ...	72,162	21,933	94,095	64,050	28,511	92,561			
2. Doro Dumnán... ..	62,871	27,506	90,377	59,802	24,886	84,670			
3. Kusba Hidgellee ...	13,417	4,911	18,328	10,379	8,597	18,976			
4. Balijora... ..	7,946	3,392	11,337	7,623	4,401	12,024			
5. Datta Khorei ...	4,214	1,473	5,687	4,142	1,252	5,394			
6. Nyabed Majna ...	1,275	409	1,684	1,183	474	1,657			
7. Naruamuta ...	17,600	9,264	26,864	13,300	13,491	26,791			
8. Sarifabad ...	2,627	1,092	3,719	2,207	1,267	3,474			
9. Amirabad ...	2,693	695	3,388	2,623	753	3,376			
10. Kismut Shipore ...	2,085	732	2,817	1,955	741	2,696			
11. " Pataspore ...	10,761	2,888	13,649	10,093	3,183	13,276			
Total ...	1,97,650	74,295	2,71,945	1,77,357	87,538	2,64,895	2.6	11.4	15.1
Mal jalpai of kismut Pataspore ...	178	21	199

12. Compared with the former settlement, the area under re-settlement now obtained shows an increase in all the pergunnahs, except Kusba Hidgellee and Balijora, where there has been a decrease owing to diluvion. The increase is most conspicuous in Doro Dumnán, which has gained largely by alluvial accretion since the last measurement. Taken as a whole, the area under settlement has increased by bighas 7,050. The assessed area has increased by bighas 20,293, while the unassessed area has diminished by bighas 13,243: all this is satisfactory.

13. The ameens' detailed measurements of fields were tested here and there professionally. The aggregate areas of the villages, obtained by totalling the areas of each field, as found by the ameens, was also tested by comparison with the areas of the villages as calculated by professional survey.

14. The following table shows the unexplained discrepancies which remain between the areas found by the survey and the settlement parties respectively in each pergunnah, after making allowance on each side for the differences which can be accounted for—

PERGUNNAHS.	Area by survey.	Area by settlement measure- ment.	AGGREGATE DIFFERENCES.		Percentage of discrepancy.
			Increase.	Decrease.	
1	2	3	4	5	6
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	
Majnamuta	45,783	45,690	93	.2
Doro Dumnán	45,540	44,976	564	1.2
Kusba Hidgellee	12,193	11,826	367	3.0
Balijora	8,638	8,645	71
Datta Khoroi	2,594*	2,652*	58	2.2
Nyabad Majna	1,261	1,219	42	3.3
Narumuta	†				
Sarifabad	1,736	1,601	45	2.6
Amirabad	2,177	2,149	28	1.3
Kisimut Shipore	1,367	1,338	29	2.1
„ Pataspore	6,879	6,656	223	3.2

* These are exclusive of the area of one village, the figures not having been received of the professional survey.

† No comparison could be made owing to the figures not having been yet received of the professional survey.

15. *Classification of land.*—The Commissioner writes as follows under this head—

Kala and jal are the main classifications of the lands throughout the estate. The kala comprise the high lands and are sub-divided into bastu (homestead) and dhasa and balu dhasa, the last two of which are suited for the production of different kinds of cold-weather crops, and in some cases bamboo and Contai nuts. The jal lands are low and fit only for the cultivation of paddy, which is the staple produce of the estate. Differences in the productiveness of this class of land are found in different pergunnahs, and sometimes in different villages in the same pergunnah. * * * * In the former settlement there were no recognized sub-divisions of the jal or rice land, but in the present settlement Mr. Price, in some instances, decided on importing a sub-division in

classification of this kind of land. * * * In Kusba Hidgellee it is said that jal lands are sub-divided into first class and second class lands. * * * In Majnamuta three classifications of jal lands have been made in accordance with the wishes of the ryots, and corresponding rates assessed on each class. * * * Jungle can hardly be met with in the estate, except in a few places outside the great sea dyke.

16. *Embankments.*—The great sea dyke referred to by the Commissioner, constructed during the last ten years and completed only two years ago, is the large embankment which runs along the coast from the junction of the Rasulpore and Hooghly to the sand-hills of Bircool. This embankment is designed to exclude a storm-wave as high as the highest ever yet known, but the only part of the Majnamuta estate which it protects is pergunnah Balijora and a very small portion of pergunnah Majnamuta. A sand ridge, some 30 to 50 feet high, and from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile in breadth, intersects the country about six miles inland from the sea parallel to which it runs, and this has in all time been a great protection to the country north of it. Above, *i.e.*, north of the Rasulpore, it is not permitted to embark against a cyclone wave from fear of causing the destruction of Calcutta, and as a consequence both Kusba Hidgellee and Doro Dumnán are exposed to this risk, and in 1864 when a large cyclone wave came up the Hooghly, both of them suffered cruelly; the mortality in Doro Dumnán alone, over which the wave made a clean sweep, being estimated at 10,000 souls. Along this part of the coast, however, and along the Huldee, the Rasulpore, and all the tributary khalls of the latter, embankments are maintained at the expense of Government sufficient to keep out the highest spring tides, and thus cultivation enjoys practical immunity in all but abnormal seasons.

17. Within these exterior embankments an elaborate system of interior embankments, called grambheries, is kept up in most pergunnahs; indeed, it might be said in all, as the smaller pergunnahs use the grambheries of the larger ones with which they are intermixed. These grambheries take the place of ails, or field ridges, which the ryots assert are not suited to Hidgellee owing to its extreme flatness. The grambheries are designed to retain on each tract its own rainfall, and each of these tracts has communication with an outlet khall or drainage channel to enable it to pass off surplus water when the rainfall is excessive. The grambheries have furnished a subject of controversy for the last 50 years. Generally speaking scientific officers and central authorities have doubted their utility, while local officers, and especially all officers engaged in settling the estate, have supported the ryots in declaring them (as these latter do) to be indispensable to cultivation.

Accordingly, in 1839, when Government granted an allowance to all the Hidgellee estates for keeping the drainage channels clear of silt (that of Majnamuta being 1,057 Sa. Rs.), a similar allowance was refused for the maintenance of grambheries, the Board and Government questioning their utility. The Settlement Officer, however, of 1845, Mr. Moffat Mills, was satisfied that they were necessary, and accordingly granted 5 per cent. extra for their maintenance, absorbing, at the same time, the allowance of 1,057 Sa. Rs. for drainage channels.

Practically therefore (though not expressly stated) the allowance (of over Rs. 6,000) served for both purposes.

20. In some pergunnahs the ryots have signed the jumma bundies, so accepting the enhanced assessment. But in several pergunnahs, and in several villages of other pergunnahs, they have absolutely refused to do so, taking the ground that the productive power of the land has actually diminished by exhaustion of the soil, and that the Settlement Officer has no right to enhance rents, except for increased area of cultivation.

21. The Board are far from satisfied that any general increase in the productive power of the soil could be established. Portions of country no doubt have been improved, and loss of crops prevented, when greater protection than formerly has been afforded, as of course have been the 20,000 bighas that have been cultivated since the last settlement; and it is to be regretted that Mr. Price has been disposed to lean more on this questionable ground and less on grounds of enhancement not open to question than was desirable.

Thus, in order to test the average pressure of his rates, the Settlement Officer has in 10 out of the 11 pergunnahs comprising the estate made elaborate calculations founded on a comparison of the present settlement with that of 1845, as regards average produce per bigha during the two periods; its value, the cost of production, and the rents, respectively. A perusal of the remarks in one case (pergunnah Majnamuta* may be taken) will show the mode of test adopted by the Settlement Officer in each case.

These calculations and tests have been applied only to the jal or rice lands, the variety of the produce of the dhasa lands making it difficult to draw similar comparisons. The assessed jal lands in the entire estate amount to 106,660 bighas out of 125,452† bighas of the assessed area, or a little over 85 per cent.; the remainder consists of dhasa and a small percentage of bastu land, and it may fairly be assumed that any increase in the rent-paying capacity which may be established in respect of the rice lands has been followed by a corresponding rise in the high lands. The following is an extract from Mr. Price's report on pergunnah Majnamuta as to the principle followed in fixing his assessments:—

“In the assessment of this pergunnah (Majnamuta), it was found difficult to institute a comparison with the rates prevailing in neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs, because there are no such pergunnahs immediately adjacent where any regular or systematic assessment has been made by the proprietors. In Bahirimuta and Dacanmal the zemindars collect according to the utbandi system, where the ryots pay what they have always done—in many cases no more than they please. If rates were to be evolved from the amount of rents paid by the ryots of these pergunnahs, they would be found scarcely, if at all, in excess of the old rates fixed for Majnamuta. Other permanently-settled pergunnahs are separated from Majnamuta by other

* *See next paragraph in which an extract from Mr. Price's report is given.*

† The total assessed area shown in the table annexed to paragraph 11 is 197,650 bighas includes about—

62,035 bighas of resumed rent-free,
6,105 bighas of cultivated waste assessed land,

4,058 bighas mokurari, kamdara, &c ; an equal proportion of this area so far as cultivated would also consist of rice land.

temporarily-settled pergunnahs, the assessment of which has been reported elsewhere; with this assessment, and the proposed assessment of Majnamuta, a comparison can fairly be instituted. * * * * A general equality will be noticed between these rates.

"There are few or no under-tenants in the pergunnah who pay rent in money to the ryot of the former settlement, with whom alone I have to deal in this re-settlement. There are under-tenants who pay half the produce to the superior ryot, or who contract to give a certain number of maunds of produce per bigha, but actual cultivating under-tenants, under agreement to pay a certain rate in money per bigha to a superior ryot, who is an absentee, or who, having too much land to cultivate it all by himself, lets it out to others, there are none or they are very scarce. Our enquiries, therefore, have been directed with a view to show that the productive powers of the soil and the value of the produce have increased since the last settlement, otherwise than at the expense or by the agency of the ryot. The Deputy Collector cut the paddy in good as well as in bad land in no less than 52 villages of the pergunnah in 1875-76; he cut again in 1876-77 in 30 villages. He found the average produce of paddy per bigha in the former year to be 9 maunds 1 seer 4 chittacks; in the latter 8 maunds 21 seers 4 chittacks. The average of the two years would be 8 maunds 31 seers 4 chittacks. As the greatest care and trouble were taken to secure accurate returns, I have little doubt that the outturn of 8 maunds 31 seers 4 chittacks is really the average produce of paddy per bigha of rice land in the pergunnah. In 1873-74 the price of paddy rose so high as Rs. 1-6 per maund; in 1875 and 1876 it fell so low as 8 annas. In fact the price of paddy is never steady in Hidgellee; but I do not think I shall be taking an abnormally high rate if I select 12 annas as the average price of paddy per maund in Hidgellee during the last few

<i>Details.</i>		Rs. A. P.		
16 seers of seed-paddy	0	5	0
7 ploughs, at 1½ annas each	0	10	6
2 coolies required to make the land fit for receiving the seed	0	3	0
5 coolies for sowing, at 1½ annas each	0	7	6
4 coolies for reaping...	0	6	0
2 coolies for carrying the paddy home	0	3	0
2 coolies for threshing	0	3	0
Wear and tear of implements	0	2	0
Total	2	8	0

years. The value of the average produce of a bigha of rice land would be at this rate Rs. 6-9-4, and to this should be added the value of the straw (8 annas)—total Rs 7-1-4. From this sum should be deducted Rs. 2-8, the average cost of cultivation per bigha that have been estimated universally throughout Hidgellee in the present re-settlements. The details are given in the margin. The ryot, after deduction of costs of cultivation, would be left with Rs. 4-9-4 to pay the rent which we have assessed on the average at Rs. 1-11 per bigha. The profit per bigha would be Rs. 2-14-4, which is considerably more than the rent the ryot would have to pay by our proposals. If the zemindar were supposed to be entitled to, say, 25 per cent. of the gross value of the produce, he would get Rs. 1-12-4, which sum even is in excess of the rate assessed by us. The average rate of the last settlement was Rs. 1-8 per bigha of rice land, and in estimating the value of a ryot's holding, the following strange calculation was made. It was said that each ryot would have in his holding three bighas of high (dhasa) land

and 12 bighas of rice land ; the costs of cultivation of the high land were estimated to be Rs. 18 and the rent Rs. 6—total Rs. 24 ; the value of the produce was estimated to be Rs. 25, the profit to the ryot was only 1 Re. for three bighas, or 5 annas 4 pie per bigha. The costs of the cultivation of the 12 bighas of rice land were estimated to be Rs. 18, the rent also to be Rs. 18—total Rs. 36 ; the value of the produce to be Rs. 41, the profit that was left to the ryot was said to be Rs. 5, or 6 annas 8 pie per bigha. In the costs of cultivation was included, it is true, the value of the ryot's own labour. If a comparison be made with the figures of the proposed re-settlement, the result is altogether in favour of our proceedings on the side of lenient treatment of the ryot. That the productive powers of the soil have increased there can be no doubt ; the Government embankments afford perfect protection to the land from salt-water inundations, whether from the sea on the east, or the Pichabani khal on the south-west, or the Serpai river on the north. The ryots cultivate now without any danger or risk save from drought ; the sluices in the public embankments afford perfect drainage of superfluous rain-water. There is no express mention made in the former papers of the outturn of a bigha of rice land, but from inference, by a consideration of the figures given in the papers of the settlement of this as well as of other pergunnahs, notably Balijora, 6 maunds, 20 seers of paddy seem to have been estimated as the outturn from a bigha, and the value per maund is expressly stated to be 7 annas. A comparison of the actuals brought to light in the present re-settlement with the estimates made at the time of the last settlement will show conclusively that both the productive powers of the land, as well as the value of the produce, have increased since 1845 without any action on the part of the ryot. That the rates are fair will appear from a consideration of the fact that one-fifth of the ryots in the 427 villages of the pergunnahs have signed the jumma bundee ; others have expressed their willingness to pay the new rates, but still have not signed ; the ryots of a few villages object to enhancement altogether."

22. The following table shows the comparative results of the present compared with the former settlement, pergunnah by pergunnah, on an average bigha of land as brought out by the Settlement Officer in accordance with his arguments detailed above—

I.—Pergunnah Majnamuta, 94,095 bighas.

[illegible]

VII.—Pergunnah Sarifabad, 3,719 bighas.

	Average produce in paddy.	VALUE OF			DEDUCT			Profit of the ryot.	
		Paddy.	Straw.	Total.	Cost of cultivation.	Average rent.	Total.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	M. S. C.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs.
Previous settlement
Present ditto	8 29 0	6 8 9	0 5 0	3 8 0	1 8 0	1 7 0	2 15 0	0 9 0	...
Percentage of gross value taken as rent									25.3
Ditto net profit as rent									39.1

VIII.—Pergunnah Amirabad, 3,388 bighas.

	M. S. C.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs.
Previous settlement
Present ditto	8 32 0	6 9 0	0 4 0	6 13 0	2 8 0	1 12 0	4 4 0	2 9 0	...
Percentage of gross value taken as rent									25.6
Ditto net profit as rent									40.6

IX.—Kismut Shipore, 2,817 bighas.

	M. S. C.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs.
Previous settlement
Present ditto	6 36 0	5 2 9	0 8 0	5 10 9	2 8 0	1 11 0	4 3 0	1 7 9	...
Percentage of gross value taken as rent									30
Ditto net profit as rent									53.2

X.—Kismut Pataspore, 13,649 bighas.

	M. S. C.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs. A.P.	Rs.
Previous settlement
Present ditto	8 3 8	6 1 0	0 8 0	6 9 0	2 8 0	1 5 6	3 13 6	2 11 6	...
Percentage of gross value taken as rent									20.4
Ditto net profit as rent									33.1

In the remaining pergunnah, Naruamuta, the rates have been enhanced by comparison with the rates prevalent in neighbouring estates.

23. In the above paragraphs the Board have given a brief outline of the elaborate arguments and calculations by which Mr. Price has sought to justify his comparatively slight augmentations of rent. Unfortunately they are, in the opinion of the Board, altogether fallacious and unsound. The value of the figures obviously depends

on the soundness of the data as to the average outturn of produce per bigha as shown in column 2 of the above table. This, it will be seen, has been carefully calculated after actual experiment by the Settlement Officers from samples of crops cut from various fields of various qualities in each pergunnah. But due consideration has not been given to the fact that both the years, *viz.*, 1875 and 1876, in which the experiments were made, were far above the average of years in productiveness. The former year was admittedly an exceptionally good year, and the latter, though not quite so good over the whole district, was very nearly as good in Hidgellee. In fact, Mr. Dampier must express his surprise at Mr. Price having been led to adopt them as average years when evidences in abundance were present to satisfy him that they were years of exceptionally good crops. The season of 1875 was generally considered to be about the best season for the rice crop within the memory of the inhabitants. His own statement that prices of paddy fell to 8 annas a maund in 1876 should have protected Mr. Price against such an error. If the outturn of these years was taken as average of yield, the ruling prices of the same years should also have been taken as average prices. The excellence of these years is a matter of general notoriety, but it is also fully borne out by the thana prices-current of the Hidgellee division quoted in paragraph 26 below, and indeed by Mr. Price's own admission above. It will be seen that in the seasons following the cutting of these crops the price of common rice fell very low, and there is no saying how much it would not have continued falling had not the earliest rumours of scarcity in Madras led to enormous exportations and a consequent rebound in prices. If, then, it were necessary for the present purpose to adopt any average of produce per bigha as likely to hold good over a series of years, it would be necessary to place it considerably lower than the average yielded by the Settlement Officer's experiments on the crops of 1875 and 1876. All the deductions as to the effect of his rates which Mr. Price has made from his averages are therefore vitiated; and indeed those deductions, as they stand, would justify an increase of rents ranging, not from 8 to 70 per cent., as the Settlement Officer has made, but in some pergunnahs of as much as 250 per cent. The very moderation of his enhancements, based of course on local experience and enquiry, shows the fallacy of the data which would justify their increase four-fold.

24. Again, taking the case of Majnamuta according to the Settlement Officer's figures, he leaves to the ryot as much as 63 per cent. of the *net* profit, while taking only 37 per cent. as the rent or zemindar's share; in other words, after deducting cost of cultivation, he gives the ryot a beneficial interest in the soil nearly twice as great as that of the zemindar. To see how widely this differs from the division of profits between zemindar and ryot, which, broadly speaking, may be said to be in vogue in the country, it may be contrasted with the proportions in which the crop is generally found to be divided where rents are taken in kind. As a general rule, the zemindar, in these cases, takes half the crop as rent, all of which is a clear gain to him; while out of the remaining half the ryot has to pay the costs of cultivation;

so that the ryot's net profit is far below that of the zemindar instead of far above it, as allowed by Mr. Price.

25. The Settlement Officer notices with surprise what he terms the extraordinary calculation of the settlement of 1845, by which so small a margin (varying from Rs. 1-3 to 6 annas 8 pie per bigha) was left to the ryot after deducting the cost of cultivation and rent from the value of the gross produce. He considers this margin would have been altogether insufficient for the support of the ryot; but he has overlooked the consideration that the ryot does not depend for his maintenance only on the margin which is left to him out of the net profit *after* deducting the cost of cultivation as well as the rent. A considerable portion, at any rate, of his maintenance comes out of the cost of cultivation, which may be said to be paid to him as the wages of his own labour and of that of his family expended on that cultivation. Theoretically, at any rate, it is precisely the cost of cultivation which supplies him, so far as he is a mere agricultural labourer, with a bare subsistence, and any margin of profit left to him after the deduction of his rent and the expenses of cultivation represents his beneficial interest in the soil as a sort of co-proprietor, and is in excess of what would be enjoyed by a ryot cultivating at the theoretical rack-rent which would just enable him to live upon the land. Thus it appears that the division of the produce made in 1845, instead of being an extraordinary calculation, far more accurately represents the relative interests of the ryot and the zemindar *after* deducting the costs of cultivation than that which Mr. Price would substitute for it.

26. Hence Mr. Dampier must conclude that Mr. Price has greatly over-estimated the average value of the produce, and also in some cases, notably in Doro Dumnan, partly balanced this by also over-estimating the cost of production, and the Settlement Officer's tests being thus rejected, it will be asked—how are the proposed enhancements to be tested? It so happens that the average value of produce (rice), with reference to which the rents were fixed at the settlement of 1845 in most of the pergunnahs, has been ascertained and recorded. On the other hand, the prices which have ruled during the last series of years are recorded in the official prices-current. A means of testing the proposed enhancement in rates is then at hand, which, if not actually precise, is sufficient for the present purpose, and which, while of the simplest and most obvious kind, strictly complies

* Section 18, Bengal Act VIII of 1869.

Section 3, Bengal Act III of 1878.

with the requirements of the enhancement laws.*

A statement, marked A, has been compiled in the Board's Office, taken from weekly thana returns of all the thanas in Hidgellee, showing the average prices of common paddy during each half of every year from 1872 to 1877. These figures are not absolutely reliable, for different Sub-Inspectors adopt different classes of paddy as their idea of the average type, and certain averages have been expressly marked in the statement as clearly too low or too high. But, comparing the position of the thanas with the known course of trade and with one another, the Board are satisfied that the ultimate average obtainable from an

analysis of them is fairly reliable as a guide to prices now obtainable. In the last column of this statement will be seen the price per maund, which, as it appears to Mr Dampier, may very safely be adopted as an average to hold good through a series of years.

27. The average has not been adopted by mechanical calculation, but by a general consideration of the prices which have ruled at different times since 1872. Any remarkably high prices which can be accounted for by special reasons have not been taken into consideration; and the fact has been borne in mind that the selling price in the field will probably be half an anna to an anna per maund lower than that recorded at the mart. Mr. Dampier has also availed himself of the local knowledge which has been available to him. On the whole, he thinks that the following average prices may be taken as being quite safely within the mark—

(A)—For Doro Dumnán, which is in direct water communication with Calcutta without payment of canal tolls, and in which prices are naturally higher than in other pergunnahs, 1½ annas 6 pie per maund.

(B)—Majnamuta, Kusba Hidgellee, Amirabad, Naruamuta, Sarifabad, and Nyabad Majna, 11 annas per maund.

(C)—It is probable that 11 annas might be taken for all the remaining pergunnahs; but to be on the safe side, Mr. Dampier would concede to Balijora, Kismut Pataspore, Datta Khoroi, and Kismut Shipore 10 annas 6 pie.

28. From these data a table has been constructed, and is given below, showing the percentage of the rise in prices in each pergunnah since the last settlement in 1845, and the percentage by which the average rates now assessed by the Settlement Officers on rice land exceed the average of the last settlement—

I.—Pergunnah Majnamuta.

	Area of jal land not included in re-umed lakhiraj land.	Total assessment on jal land.	Average rate of rent per bigha.	Average price of paddy per maund.
1	2	3	4	5
	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement ...	30,461	43,957	1 7 0	0 7 0
Present ditto ...	38,071	63,595	1 11 0	0 11 0
Percentage of increase	17 3	57 1

II.—Pergunnah Doro Dumnán.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement ...	27,929	44,466	1 9 6	0 8 3
Present ditto ...	32,538	64,199	1 15 6	0 14 6
Percentage of increase	23 5	75 7

III.—Pergunnah Kusba Hidgellee.

	Area of jal land not included in resumed lakhiraj land.	Total assessment on jal land.	Average rate of rent per bigha.	Average price of paddy per maund.
1	2	3	4	5
	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	5,518	6,345	1 2 6	0 5 4*
Present ditto	6,428	11,777	1 13 0	0 11 0
Percentage of increase	56'7	100'0

IV.—Pergunnah Balijora.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	3,487	4,749	1 6 0	0 7 0
Present ditto	4,399	7,463	1 11 0	0 10 6
Percentage of increase	22'7	50'1

V.—Pergunnah Datta Khoroi.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	1,671	2,251	1 5 6	About 0 7 0
Present ditto	2,535	4,147	1 9 6	0 10 6
Percentage of increase	18'6	50'

VI.—Pergunnah Nyabad Majna.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	669	623	0 15 0	0 6 0
Present ditto	744	1,138	1 9 6	0 11 0
Percentage of increase	70'0	83'3

VII.—Pergunnah Sarifabad.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	1,379	2,007	1 7 0	0 7 0
Present ditto	1,590	2,808	1 12 6	0 11 0
Percentage of increase	23'9	57'1

VIII.—Pergunnah Amirabad.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	866	1,287	1 8 0	0 6 6
Present ditto	918	1,624	1 12 0	0 11 0
Percentage of increase	16'6	60'

IX.—Kismut Shipore.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	1,115	1,749	1 9 0	Not above 0 7 0
Present ditto	1,213	2,047	1 11 0	0 10 6
Percentage of increase	8'0	50'

* Probably this was an under-estimate.

X.—Kismut Pataspore.

	Area of jalland not included in resumed lakhiraj land.	Total assessment on jall land.	Average rate of rent per bigha.	Average price of paddy per maund.
1	2	3	4	5
	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	3,583	3,989	1 2 0	Say 0 6 6
Present ditto	6,497	8,777	1 5 6	0 10 6
Percentage of increase	19'4	61'4

XI.—Pergunnah Naruamuta.

	Bighas.	Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement	Say 0 6 6
Present ditto	11,637	15,266	1 5 0	0 11 0
Percentage of increase	66'2

29. It will be seen that in every instance, except Naruamuta, where an average at the former settlement cannot be obtained, and where the ryots have all agreed, the increase in the value of the produce much exceeds the proportionate increase which has been made in the average rent. It seems to Mr. Dampier that this is practically a safeguard that the Settlement Officer's average rates are not excessive. No test can be fairer than this, and it has been worked out entirely on the side of the ryot. Assuming the productive powers of the soil to be the same as at the last settlement, instead of their having greatly increased as the Settlement Officer considers, it is evident that a less portion of that produce need be sold to pay the rent now fixed than would have had to be sold in 1845. Thus a large quantity of produce would be left to the ryot, and as this also would sell for better prices, it would meet all the increased cost of production, as well as leave a larger margin for the improvement of the ryot's lot.

30. Indeed, the Board, looking to the increase of prices, believe it would be possible to justify a larger increase, but presume that Government will be content with enforcing the enhancement which the Settlement Officer after full local enquiry has adopted.

31. Obviously it does not follow that because the average rates are fair, they are also fair as applied to each individual ryot. Mr. Dampier has therefore taken pains to satisfy himself that the application of rates to each individual plot has been satisfactorily carried out. It would be impossible for the confirming authority to make a separate award as regards each separate holding, except in the case of a special appeal; but it appears to the Board that they ought to be able to approve of the average rates and of the general method by which they have assessed upon individuals. Mr. Price was accordingly called upon for a more particular description of the manner of adjudication of rates.

32. From his reply it appears that the procedure followed was this—The lands were first classified by the measuring ameen; his work

was checked by the peshkar. Every village was then visited by the subordinate Settlement Officer who tested the measurements and classifications. The chittahs and khatyans being prepared, the ryots were called upon to sign the papers in token of the correctness of the measurement and classification. Any objections made were specially enquired into, and for the most part satisfactorily disposed of, and the khatyans and chittahs have been almost universally attested by the ryots. Mr. Price personally tested several villages in every pergunnah in the years 1874, 1875, and 1876, and enquired into the classification which had been made. He was not on the whole satisfied with the result of his tests as regards kala or high lands; and accordingly, in 1876, he deputed amlah from his office, who tested the classifications of all lands throughout the 21 pergunnahs of Hidgellee. In the same year Mr. Price ordered the Deputy and Sub-Deputy Collectors to make a second enquiry into the measurement and classification of lands. This done, the subordinate Settlement Officers *personally* assessed the rates on both jal and kala lands, and Mr. Price approved or modified them according as the exigencies of each case seemed to require. It was only then that the jummaabundee was drawn up.

33. It appears to the Board that this procedure furnishes all the guarantee that can be expected that the rates are fair. The Board have satisfied themselves by tests, which they consider most reliable, that the average increase is below that which might have been demanded. It also appears that the apportionment of this average was made with care and sifted by many checks; that the ryots as a rule consented to the classification and area of their lands, and for the most part signed the papers; and no particular objections to particular assessments have reached the Board. It seems therefore that the rates may be confirmed. The annexed statement B shows the rates that were actually assessed in each pergunnah on each class of land at the last settlement and at the settlement now proposed.

34. The Board have not thought it necessary to apply any independent check as regards the bastu and dhasa (kala) or high land rates. It will be seen from the statement above referred to that on the whole the ratio of increase is less than on the jal lands, while the crops grown upon them are so varied that any attempt to compare former with present prices would have been impracticable. Moreover, had such information been attainable, it would, the Board believe, have proved less reliable as a check than a permanent rise in the value of rice. When one single crop completely forms the staple crop of the country, as paddy does in Hidgellee, its fluctuations, so far as they are permanent and continuous, will be the best guide to the fluctuations of rent of all kinds. Hence Mr. Dampier would on general grounds confirm the rates of rent of bastu and dhasa lands no less than of jal.

35. *Interior drainage channels and grambheries.*—The question of the maintenance of grambheries and drainage channels, which has been already referred to,* is inseparably connected with that of

determining the rates of rent. The orders of Government now in force on the subject are those of 5th July 1872, No. 2878, to the effect that the obligation to repair grammbheries shall, in the present settlement, be imposed on the ryots. This innovation is resented by them. The Settlement Officer reports that even those who have expressed their acceptance of the enhanced rates of rent by signing the jumabundies have positively refused to accept pottahs containing the stipulation that the obligation of maintaining the grammbheries shall rest upon them. The Commissioner writes—

“Neither the zemindars nor the ryots would agree to take upon themselves their respective liabilities to maintain the interior drainage channels and grammbheries. The former Commissioner, Mr. Cockerell, asked Mr. Price to report if the responsibility of the ryots to repair the grammbheries was so entirely beyond dispute that any court will enforce it, and whether the refusal was owing to their determination to evade the obligation. The Settlement Officer reports that the liability of the ryots of Hidgellee to repair their grammbheries was directed for the first time by the orders of Government, No. 2878 of the 5th July 1872; and it is doubtful if those orders would be considered binding on the ryots in case that the question is taken into a court of justice. Most certainly the ryots would plead that, according to the terms of the last settlement, the obligation rested on the zemindars, who were, in the case of a great many pergunnahs in Hidgellee, given an allowance of 5 per cent. on the gross assets expressly for the purpose of repairing the grammbheries; and this fact, with the well-known bias of the civil courts to give an award adverse to Government, will tend to the result that the ryots would be absolved from the obligation attempted to be put on them. I think, however, that the orders of Government above referred to are final, and it is our duty to act up to them, leaving the parties dissatisfied with our action to seek for any remedy they make like.”

36. The whole question of the maintenance of grammbheries has, however, been fully discussed in a separate report,* which has been submitted to Government, and it has been recommended that the arrangement of the previous settlement shall be renewed by which the obligation was fixed on the zemindars, an allowance of 5 per cent. being made to them for the purpose. It has been proposed to impose certain safeguards to ensure, as far as practicable, the proper fulfilment of their obligation by the zemindars.

37. *Class of ryots.*—The following account of the different classes of ryots given by the Settlement Officer for pergunnah Majnamuta is generally applicable to the entire estate:—

“There are in the pergunnah 8,554 resident or khoodkhast ryots, and 9,120 paikast or non-resident ryots, who have held their jotes for 12 years and more. Both these classes have acquired rights of occupancy under the law. There are 537 non-resident ryots, who have not held for 12 years, and who have acquired no rights of occupancy. The former settlement papers show that resident or khoodkhast ryots cannot be ejected so long as they pay the rent. They can sell or otherwise dispose of their holdings, which descend

* No. 384A, dated 4th June 1878.

from father to son, and so on, and they can cut down all trees planted and reared by themselves. Non-resident ryots of 12 years' standing also can sell and dispose of their holdings, but they are restricted to enjoying the fruit of the trees growing on their holdings; they cannot cut them down. They cannot be ejected so long as they pay their rents. Non-resident ryots of less than 12 years' standing have scarcely any rights; but even they, I propose, should not be ejected so long as they pay their rents. During the term of this re-settlement the zemindars will be debarred from enhancing the rents assessed by this department. They do not contest the rights of the ryots as I have described them above. They themselves have the rights of resident ryots with regard to their nijjote.

"Besides the aforementioned classes of ryots, there are 13 holdings called 'kamdara,' where the rent has been fixed in perpetuity on the ryot at low rates. These kamdara holdings are hereditary. The owners of resumed rent-free holdings are not, strictly speaking, ryots at all."

38. The Commissioner has accepted the Settlement Officer's proposals. Ryots who have acquired rights of occupancy will be recorded as such, and, according to the avowed policy of the Government, protected from enhancement during the period of the settlement beyond the rates recorded as payable by the Deputy Collector under Bengal Act III of 1878. Without questioning the expediency of such a course and its advantages, Mr. Dampier doubts whether, in giving such prospective protection, the Settlement Officer is not exceeding his legal powers. In providing that the zemindar shall not exercise his legal right of enhancement for say 30 years, it can scarcely be said that the Settlement Officer is confining himself to the record of rights which

* *Vide* section 9, Regulation VII of 1822.

he finds existing at the time of settlement,* or even that he is only consolidating and giving precise definition to rights which he found existing in a vague and indistinct shape. He is, in fact, actually creating a new right.

39. The Settlement Officer, it will be seen, further proposes that even non-resident ryots of less than 12 years' standing, who have scarcely any rights, should be protected from ejection, so long as they pay their rent, and from enhancement during the term of settlement. Here it appears to Mr. Dampier that the proposal involves a still more serious transgression of the limits of a Settlement Officer's powers. Mr. Dampier's views on this subject were laid before the Lieutenant-Governor in the case of the settlement of the noabad talooks in Chittagong. These talooks were, however, the property of Government, and no doubt Government was in a position to impose what restrictions it thought proper on the talookdars as a condition of admitting them to settlement. But here the case is different. The estate is the property of private proprietors, subject only to a liability to re-assessment from time to time of the Government revenue under Regulation VII of 1822. Nothing in section 9 of that Regulation, nor in any other law of which Mr. Dampier is aware, authorizes a Settlement Officer thus to convert the holdings of tenants-at-will into privileged holdings. The

question is one of importance, and the orders of Government will affect almost every future settlement.

40. The Settlement Officer next proposes as follows :—

“Rights of occupancy should be conceded to the ryots in all jungle or culturable waste land which they clear and embank for purposes of cultivation, having taken leases of it from the Deputy Collector.”

Section 8, Regulation VII of 1822, authorizes the Settlement Officer to give in perpetuity, or for periods determined by Government, leases of waste land belonging to a mehal under settlement to any persons who may be willing to undertake the cultivation, assigning to the zemindars an amount equivalent to 10 *per cent.* on the amount payable by the lessees. As the proposal of the Settlement Officer above quoted is much more favourable to the zemindar's interest than the action which he might legally take under the law cited, it may be approved.

41. *Baruas*.—There exist in this estate, and in Jellamuta, a class of village headmen, locally known as *baruas*. Each village in Hidgelee has its barua, though one barua sometimes acts for two or three villages; and in large villages two or three baruas are found. They are considered entitled as a kind of remuneration to a deduction from the jumma of their holdings to the extent of from $\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 *per cent.* on the gross assets of the village. The barua-chhar or allowances granted to the baruas at the former settlement of Majnamuta and those now proposed are shown below :—

	Rs.
(1) Amount remitted at the settlement of 1845 ...	2,320
(2) Amount to be remitted now, if calculated at the old rate generally, one and a half <i>per cent.</i> on the proposed enhanced jumma would be ...	3,596
(3) Amount actually proposed to be remitted at the present settlement, calculated either at the old rate or at a lump sum as before ...	2,893

42. The question has been raised with much plausibility by the Commissioner that the retention of the baruas is useless, and that it is expedient to abolish the appointment in the present settlement and resume the allowances. Mr. Wells, in contending for their abolition, puts the matter as follows :—

“As far as I have been able to ascertain, baruas have no definite duty beyond being village headmen and referees. By local usage they are supposed to perform the following services :—

- (1) To assist the revenue and police officers when employed on duty.
- (2) To report the occurrence of all heinous offences, and give information of bad characters to the zemindar and the police.
- (3) To give receipts for service of processes and to accompany the process peon.
- (4) To assist tehsildars in the collection of rents.

- (5) To collect and bring the ryots for purposes of settlement.
- (6) To point out boundaries of villages and of ryots' holdings, and to preserve boundary marks.
- (7) To accompany the chowkidar on his rounds.

"But in point of fact they are, with few exceptions, contumacious and obstructive, and fail to do, or leave the putwary and chowkidar to do, what they as baruas are paid to perform.

"Most of the baruas cannot read or write; they are remunerated by a deduction from the jumma of their holdings, and the deduction amounts from eight annas to two per cent. on the gross assets of the villages. Persons originally selected for the post of baruas were generally the headmen of the villages, and in many cases the appointments have not gone out of the family, but, owing to the small remuneration allowed to the baruas, the appointment is not much appreciated at the present time.

"Baruas are worse than useless in rendering any assistance to the police or to the revenue authorities. They proved themselves the most obstructive in the present re-settlement proceedings. In many instances, if not in all, they were the first and foremost to dissuade the ryots from agreeing to the rates assessed by the Settlement Officer, and the refusal of the ryots to sign the jumma bundee is partly ascribed to the opposition of the baruas.

"The only drawback in abolishing the baruas is that the institution has existed long, and it has grown to be the custom in many quarters to deprecate any interference with the old established village usage. This consideration, however, I think becomes of no valid weight when the fact of the large sacrifice of public revenue in maintaining this useless and obstructive staff is borne in mind.

"The zemindars, on whose recommendation the baruas are appointed, denounce the institution and desire its abolition. My predecessor, Mr. Smith, was in favour of doing away with the baruas, and of amalgamating their duties with those of the putwaries, who under the law must be appointed. Mr. Price thinks the baruas quite unnecessary in Hidgellee, and observes that, if putwaries are appointed to act immediately under the orders of the sub-divisional authorities, there will be a saving of much needless expense by the abolition of the village headmen, whose duties can very well be taken up by the putwaries.

"Baruas, too, are no longer needed for police purposes; for, under the Chowkidari Act, a punchayet of responsible headmen has been created all over the country, which is nowhere a remunerated service.

"I quite concur with my predecessor and Mr. Price, and think that putwaries will be perfectly able to do the duties of baruas in regard to revenue matters, and the punchayet and chowkidars in regard to police matters, if they are well paid. In short, to retain baruas is to keep up a divided responsibility, which is always weak, for the barua will say that he believed the putwary and chowkidars had done all that was necessary."

43. This appeared to the Board to be a somewhat hazardous and radical alteration, specially as in principle it seemed to amount to this—that in Government or temporarily-settled estates village headmen ought to be abolished. A letter was therefore written asking—

“(1) Whether in the villages which *have* accepted Mr. Price's terms the baruas have accepted, on the faith of being allowed barua-chhars or remissions, or whether they have accepted the higher rates without any stipulation for such remissions.

“(2) What amount of rent will be saved throughout Jellamuta and Majnamuta if baruas are abolished.

“(3) Will the villagers be able to get on without any representative or ‘go-between’ between themselves and the zemindar. A putwary will, it is understood, have charge of many villages, and a chowkidar is looked upon as the *servant* of a village and not its *representative*.

“Mr. Price's opinion on the entire subject should be submitted for the information of the Board, with your reply.”

44. Mr. Price on the 29th March replied as follows:—

“No proposals were made during the course of my re-settlement proceedings which had for their object the grant of the barua allowance, on condition either that the baruas themselves accepted the enhanced rates of rent assessed by me or persuaded the other ryots of the village to do so. In those few cases in which the baruas, together with the ryots of the village, have accepted the proposed rates, they have done so irrespective of any promises to remit the ‘barua-chhar.’

“Both the subordinate settlement officers who are still retained in the district, and whom I consulted (Deputy Collector Baboo Koilash Chunder Chatterjee and Sub-Deputy Collector Mr. J. H. Mendies) are decidedly of opinion that baruas are worse than useless, and have done all in their power to throw obstacles in the way of the re-settlement proceedings. Baboo Koilash Chunder Chatterjee says: ‘During the time of the re-settlement, so far as I have been able to ascertain from my personal experience, the baruas are rather against enhancement. In many villages the ryots first accepted the present assessment, but through the instigation of these and other village headmen they afterwards refused to do so;’ and again: ‘I think that there is no work which the villagers will not be able to get on without any representative or go-between between themselves and the zemindars.’ Mr. Mendies says: the baruas are considered as the head village officials on behalf of Government or the zemindar, and as such they may be called the village headmen;’ and again: ‘I believe the villagers will be able to get on better without them.’ The zemindars themselves of the two estates have petitioned for their abolition. I myself also am of opinion that on the whole the institution of baruas can very well be done away with. They are not so much the exponents of public opinion in the village as the originators themselves of opposition to Government officials. Ryots on the point of giving in and signing the jumabundee have been dissuaded from doing so on the representations of the baruas. It seems inconsistent for Government to pay a class of village officials

who are the first to oppose its officers when re-settlements come to be made. Baboo Koilash Chunder Chatterjee thinks that they are found useful in only one respect, namely in pointing out boundaries of villages and fields. But in the present re-settlement all such boundaries have been most carefully laid down, and there can arise no practical difficulty in future in ascertaining what the real boundary of a village is. Besides, baruas (synonymous with ameens—both expressions being used in Hidgellee) there is a class of village headmen elected by the villagers themselves who are much more than baruas, the real representatives of the villagers. The representatives are called mukhyas, and I am of opinion they stand in the position of go-between between the ryots and the zemindars. I do not perceive the necessity of Government maintaining baruas at a large annual allowance, besides paying a considerable sum, Rs. 14,252, yearly from the revenues of the estates for chowkidars in Majnamuta and Jellamuta. Mr. Mendies says—“the institution of the office of baruas, who are also called ameens throughout Hidgellee, seems to me to have originated since the commencement of the salt manufacture. They are required to afford assistance to the Revenue, Police, and D. P. Works officers, as would appear from the conditions of their appointment, by which they were expected to prevent the illicit manufacture of salt, to report all offences committed within their respective jurisdictions to the police, to assist the embankment officers in supplying coolies and materials, to assist the revenue officers at the time of settlement, and to act as a go-between to explain the rates assessed, &c. All such duties they no longer perform.” I may add that, in these days, the baruas are not generally supposed to be liable to perform all the duties enumerated by Mr. Mendies. It is quite certain that they rarely give the assistance they used to afford formerly, and I doubt whether legally they could be compelled to do so. Dismissal from this office is the only consequence of a barua disobeying orders. Being in the pay of Government, he ought to be the official headman of the village and to be careful primarily of the interests of Government, only secondarily of those of the ryots; but almost universally he is found on the side against Government. I must say I cannot discern the expediency of Government paying a man to consistently oppose it.”

45. Mr. Dampier, however, was not satisfied. It appeared to him that the settlement staff were disposed, at the instigation of the zemindars, to deprive the ryots of the headmen to whom they usually look for support in the case of oppression, and another letter was accordingly written to the Commissioner, in which it was said that—

“Before passing any orders on the proposal, Mr. Dampier would like to see extracts from the proceedings and reports of the last settlement which explain the duties of baruas and their position. He also wishes to know whether mukhyas and baruas are to be found in the same villages; and, if so, to what extent, and whether mukhyas get any remuneration of any sort, voluntary or otherwise.

“Mr. Price should be desired to explain precisely what he means by saying that baruas will be unnecessary if the putwaries are appointed

to perform their duties directly under the sub-divisional officer. The duties of a putwary and his position are defined in Regulation XII of 1817. How far do the duties there specified embrace those which are now recognized as the barua's duties? and does Mr. Price propose to impose on putwaries any duties which are not covered by the Putwary Regulation? If so, he should state what they are.

"The question of the abolition of the institution of baruas has been fully discussed in the present correspondence from the Government and the zemindar's point of view, but not from the ryot's point of view. Mr. Price should therefore ascertain and report what the wishes of the villagers are on the subject. Do they object to the abolition of the institution? If so, on what grounds? Or is it expected that if the barua allowance were abolished no objection would be made except by the baruas themselves? What services do they or ought they to perform for the ryots? And as a fact are they looked upon or are they practically the champions of the ryots in resisting any proceedings whereby they consider that the ryots' rights are being infringed?"

46. To this it was replied by Mr. Price in his letter to the Commissioner—

"I have the honour to submit copies of the extracts noted
NORR.—These extracts generally recount the duties as explained above in paragraph 42. in the margin from the last settlement proceedings which will explain the duties of baruas and their position.

"Regarding mukhyas, Sub-Deputy Collector Mr. Mendies reports that—'Besides the baruas there is a mukhya attached to each village who receives no money remuneration, but is held in respect by the ryots, and on weddings and other festivities it is the custom to allow the mukhya of the village a certain number of betel-nuts in token of respect. He, too, like the barua, presides on all such occasions.' Mr. Mendies' words apply more particularly to the pergunnah of Doro Dumnan. *In the other 20 pergunnahs of Hidgellee, mukhyas, as separate village officials, are rarely found,* the chief inhabitant of the village being very often called the mukhya.

"With reference to paragraph 3 of the Board's letter, I beg to explain that in clause 3, section 16 of Regulation XII of 1817, it is said that putwaries are bound to perform all other duties and services which it has been customary for them to execute. I think under this provision they may very conveniently be made to point out village boundaries and position of ryots' holdings (which, however, have been carefully ascertained and defined by the re-settlement survey), to assist in the collection of revenue, and to render assistance in service of all kinds of notices which, so far as I understand, are the only duties connected with the Revenue Department that baruas have been hitherto considered liable to perform.

"On the question of the abolition of baruas Mr. Mendies writes—'The opinion of the ryots as to the abolition of the baruas is divided. The enlightened classes are in favour of the abolition of the institution. The ignorant classes, only such as the general body of ryots of Naruamuta, are against it however. These latter look upon the barua as a

public officer who is supposed to know all about the ryots' holdings, area, measurements, &c., and in cases of dispute is supposed to act as arbitrator; but the barua of the present day seldom acts honestly with those who rely upon him for advice. He generally inclines to the side of those who can meet his demands, or with whom he is on good terms. I do not think that any objection would be made by the ryots if the barua allowance were abolished. They are no doubt supposed to be the champions of the ryots, but instead of looking to their interests they look upon their own. In fact, in Doro Dumnán, where the ryots are better informed, the barua generally sides with the well-to-do ryots or the zemindars' underlings, in order to harass the poorer classes. In the other pergunnahs of Hidgellee, however, it appears that the ryots would look upon the abolition of baruas as a hardship. It is the custom there to ask the permission of the zemindars before engaging in certain rites and ceremonies on the occasions of births, deaths, marriages, &c. This permission is obtained directly from the barua, who is looked upon by the ryots as the zemindars' representative. Were baruas abolished, the ryots would have to go to the zemindars' houses to obtain the requisite permission, and they would object to the delay and trouble that would be incurred in getting it, there being six zemindars in the Majnamuta estate, and two in the Jellamuta estate.

"It is the custom for the baruas to decide disputes, principally those regarding land, that arise among the ryots of their villages. Such interference by the barua is preferred to a recourse to the civil courts. The ryots generally doubtless look upon baruas as their champions in resisting any proceedings whereby they consider that their rights are being infringed."

47. The Officiating Commissioner, Mr. Pellew, in forwarding this letter, expresses himself against the abolition of baruas, on the following grounds:—

"I confess I am not of opinion that it is a good thing to get rid of these village officials. On the contrary, I would again define their duties and re-organize them; though, with reference to the enhanced rate of rent, and the diminution of their duties, I think $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. would now be sufficient remuneration. The fact that they caused trouble at the settlement in itself rather tends to show that they do strengthen the ryots against the zemindar, and Mr. Price admits this fact in his letter, except in regard to pergunnah Doro Dumnán. The prejudice against them on the part of the Settlement Officers is natural; but in my opinion any organization which can cast a light on, and bring to the surface the opinions and wishes of, the ryots at settlement time is really a great benefit, as is well known the most unjust settlements may be made without a word being said, and the faults are only disclosed by accumulating arrears. Moreover, for statistical and most purposes, and for punctual collection of rents and good detailed management, such officers are invaluable, and it is owing to the want of any such in most estates that khas management in Bengal so often fails."

48. In this state the question has come before Lord Ulick Browne, who is of opinion that the ryots should have a powerful voice in the decision of the question, which is the abolition or retention of an old established institution, while the village headmen, if well utilized and made the most of, certainly ought to be useful. Considering the *pros* and *cons* of the case, the presence of mukhyas or other headmen in pergunnah Doro Dumnán, and not in the other pergunnahs as a rule, and that in that pergunnah, where the ryots are described as more enlightened, they do not care for the baruas, but are rather in favour of their abolition, Lord Ulick Browne proposes to make the experiment suggested by Mr. Wells, in Doro Dumnán alone, at the present settlement, and that Government should be guided in their subsequent action by the results.

49. As described above (paragraphs 5 and 6), Doro Dumnán stands far apart from the other pergunnahs of Majnamuta and Jellamuta; it is in a different sub-division, and much nearer Calcutta. Lord Ulick Browne would therefore resume the allowances in that pergunnah and abolish the institution. In the other pergunnahs, where it is reported that ryots would look upon the abolition of the baruas as a hardship, and where it might entail many inconveniences, he would retain them for the present.

50. The several points on which the present orders of Government are required, may be summarized thus—

- (a) The confirmation of the proceedings by which the rates of rent demandable from the cultivators have been ascertained and recorded as contemplated by Bengal Act III of 1878.
Paragraphs 18 to 34.
- (b) The question of ryots or zemindars being required to maintain gramsheries, on which a separate report has been submitted.
Paragraphs 17, 35, and 36.
- (c) Whether the Settlement Officer has or has not exceeded his powers in debarring the zemindars from enhancing by legal process the rents of ryots, whether possessing rights of occupancy or not, during the term of the settlement?
Paragraphs 30 to 39.
- (d) The Settlement Officer's proposal to concede rights of occupancy to ryots in jungle or cultivable waste land reclaimed by them.
Paragraph 40.
- (e) Abolition of the village officials called *baruas*.
Paragraphs 41 to 49.

51. In conclusion, I am to say that, when the decision of Government shall have been received on these points, the sudder jumma will be fixed, and the arrangements will be made in accordance therewith with the proprietors if they agree. A final report of the result will be duly submitted to Government.

52. I am further desired to state that the whole of this report was prepared while Mr. Dampier was at the Board and under his responsibility, except paragraphs 32, 33, and 34 and paragraphs 41 to 49. It was Mr. Dampier's expressed wish that this should be explained.

A.

Statement showing the average prices of Paddy during each half-year from 1872 to 1877, referred to in paragraph 26 of Board's Report No. 468A, dated 2nd July 1878.

THANA.	Perunnahs to which they are a guide.	Items.	AVERAGE PRICE PER MAUND.											Nine new aver-ages.
			1872.	1873, first-half.	1873, second-half.	1874, first-half.	1874, second-half.	1875, first-half.	1875, second-half.	1876, first-half.	1876, second-half.	1877, first-half.	1877, second-half.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Contai ...	This thana is the best guide to perunnahs of Majnara, Satala, Kharabadi, Sarlabad, and Nyabad.	Paddy ...	Rs. A. 0 9 4	Rs. A. 0 9 6	Famine in Behar. Rs. A. 0 12 5	Cyclone. Rs. A. (A) 1 7 7	Very good crops. Rs. A. 1 0 8	Madras famine Rs. A. 0 11 6						As. 11
Raghoonaibpore	South-west of all Majnara muta perunnahs, since its rates would be lower than what would be obtainable in Majnaramuta.	Ditto ...	0 10 8	0 8	0 8 6	1 0 8	1 0 8	0 10 6	0 10	0 12	1 13	9 5		
Bhagwanpore ...	Corresponds mainly with Jellannuta, but is also a guide to Narayamuta and North-west of Kismut Pataapore.	Ditto ...	0 13	0 12 3	0 12 5	0 15 2	(B) 0 14 9	1 0 4	0 10 6	1 0 4 (A)	1 7 7	11		
Pataspore	This thana includes Kushba Hidgellee	Ditto ...	0 12 3	0 11 4	0 12	1 1 8	(A) 1 6 8	1 2 3	0 15 6	0 10 1	0 11	10 5		
Khedgerce	In a guide to Datka Khorol, Kismut Shipore, and the north-west end of Majnara muta.	Ditto ...	0 11 2	(B) 0 8 6	(B) 0 9 4	(B) 0 15 6	(B) 1 0	(B) 1 0 4	1 1 3	0 12 5	0 11 4	11 5		
Ezra ...		Ditto ...	0 11	0 8 9	0 12 8	1 2 3	1 3 4	1 2 3	1 0	0 10 8	0 10 5	10 5		
Musundipore ...	In a guide to Doro Dumanan, the prices of wheat will be a little higher than those of Doro Dumanan.	Ditto ...	0 15 2	0 13 3	0 14 5	1 2 3	(B) 1 3 4	(B) 1 0	(B) 1 0 8	0 12	0 12 8	1 0	1 5 3	14
Sootahatta	Precisely corresponds to Doro Dumanan.	Ditto ...	0 15 2	0 14 5	0 15 2	1 4 6	(B) 1 4	(B) 1 0 8	1 4	0 15 2	0 15 2	1 0 8	1 6 9	15
Nundigram	In half way between Doro Dumanan and Kusba Hidgellee; its rates would be lower than the former and higher than the latter.	Ditto ...	0 14 5	0 13	0 13 3	(A) 1 4 6	(A) 1 5 6	1 0 4	1 1 3	0 11 4	0 11 2	0 13 9	1 4 3	13 5
These averages marked (A) are such as are considered from local knowledge to be above the correct price of common paddy. Ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto														

No. 2038, dated Calcutta, the 3rd September 1878.

From—A. MACKENZIE, Esq., Secretary to the Government of Bengal,
Revenue Department,

To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue,* Land Revenue Department.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 468A, dated 2nd July 1878, submitting a full and elaborate report by Mr. Dampier on the proceedings connected with the settlement of the Majnamuta estate in the district of Midnapore.

2. In reply, I am to request that the Lieutenant-Governor's thanks may be conveyed to Mr. Dampier for his report, which gives a clear and able review of all the facts bearing on the settlement operations in the Majnamuta estate.

3. It is not necessary for Government to notice in detail the history and progress of the settlement, or to recapitulate the facts set forth in the preliminary paragraphs of your letter. The points upon which the orders of Government are required are summed up in your 50th paragraph, and I am to proceed at once to notice each of these in the order of arrangement adopted by the Board.

4. First, then, as regards the question of the fairness of the proposed rates of rent, discussed at length in paragraphs 18-34 of the report, it appears that owing to the extent and variety of the lands under settlement, it was impossible to make the rates paid by neighbouring ryots any general test for determining the new rates. The Settlement Officer therefore proceeded to assess these new rates on the theory that the productive powers of the land had increased in consequence of protective and other works maintained by Government, and that the market value of the produce of the lands had increased since the last settlement of the estate in 1845.

5. In some pergunnahs the ryots have accepted the rates fixed by the Settlement Officer upon these grounds, but in the majority of instances they have rejected them, alleging that the productive powers of the lands in the estate have deteriorated, and not improved. In the opinion of the Board, it would be difficult to prove any general increase in the productive powers of the soil, and Mr. Price should not have laid so much stress on this point. The Board also take exception to the argument by which Mr. Price attempts to prove that the pressure of the enhanced rates fixed by him in each pergunnah, is moderate with reference to the increase in the value of the produce of the lands. In 10 out of the 11 pergunnahs constituting the estate, he has compared the proposed rates with those of 1845 by examining the average produce per bigha, its value, and the cost of production at each period. Mr. Price's argument rests entirely on the soundness of the data as to the average outturn of produce per bigha taken by him. He appears to have gone by the outturn of the crops of 1875 and 1876, and as both those years were admittedly years not of average but of exceptionally good crops, while prices at the same time were exceptionally high in consequence of impending famine in Madras, the Board rightly argue that the test adopted by Mr. Price is in itself fallacious. Looking at the figures in column 2 of the statement

given in paragraph 22 of the present report, it is indeed difficult to believe that the average outturn of a bigha of land had risen in pergunnah Balijora, for example, from 5 maunds 10 seers in 1845 to 10 maunds 31 seers in 1876, and in pergunnah Datta Khoroi from 3 maunds 36 seers to 9 maunds 20 seers. Mr. Dampier's examination of Mr. Price's position, contained in paragraphs 23-25 of your letter is, in the Lieutenant-Governor's opinion, conclusive, as showing that Mr. Price has over-estimated the average value of the produce, and that his tests are in other ways misleading.

6. The Board, however, believing on general grounds that the rates fixed by Mr. Price are in reality reasonable, have adopted a different method of testing their propriety. Utilizing the recorded information about the average value of produce, with reference to which the rates of rent were fixed in 1845, and taking a fair average of the prices prevailing from 1872 to 1877, and comparing the data so obtained, the Board have framed a table which shows the percentage of the rise in prices in each pergunnah since the last settlement in 1845, and the percentage by which the average rates now assessed on rice lands exceed the average of the last settlement. From this statement it appears that the increase in the value of the produce is far in advance of the increase in rent in every pergunnah, except Nyabad Majna, in which the value of produce has risen only 83 per cent., while the rent of land is to be increased 70 per cent.

7. The Board presume that Government will accept the rates proposed by the Settlement Officer, though the adoption of much higher rates could, in their opinion, be justified. If the figures given by the Board were taken as anything more than a test, showing that the settlement rates proposed by Mr. Price are not on the whole excessive, some stress might be laid on the inequality of the enhancement in the different parts of the estate, but from paragraphs 31-33 of your letter it appears that in fact the rates have been determined *locally* by detailed enquiry extending over several years. The Lieutenant-Governor, therefore, is willing to accept the conclusion arrived at by the Board that, on the whole, the rates fixed by Mr. Price are moderate, and such as will not press unduly on the ryots. It would be well however, to make some further enquiry into the case of Nyabad, Majna, where the Board's test shows that the increase of rent is exceptionally high.

8. The second point upon which orders are solicited relates to the relative obligations of the zemindars and the ryots with reference to the maintenance of gramdheries. It is stated that in all probability the ryots would have accepted the settlement rates long ere now, but for their objections to the orders of Sir George Campbell throwing upon them the onus of maintaining the gramdheries. This matter has been disposed of in a manner favourable to the ryots by the orders conveyed in my letter No. 7827T, dated 6th July last, to which I am to refer the Board. The third point for orders is that discussed in paragraphs 37-40 of your letter. The Settlement Officer proposes to debar the zemindars from enhancing the rents during the whole term of the settlement.

9. Mr. Dampier remarks that, 'as regards occupancy ryots, the Settlement Officer's proposal, though probably illegal, is *in accordance with the avowed policy of Government*. He objects, however, to that part of the proposal which would convert non-occupancy ryots into privileged holders. The Board seem to be under some misapprehension as to "the avowed policy of Government" in this matter. In regard to Government estates, it has certainly been ruled that farmers and lessees should not enhance the rents of the ryots during the term of the settlement, and this principle has been applied in the case of the Noabad talooks of Chittagong, which are practically Government estates; but the Lieutenant-Governor is not aware that Government ever claimed the power of debarring a private zemindar from exercising the rights which the law gives him of enhancing in a legal manner the rents of lands in his estate. In the case of the Majnamuta estate, which is private property, the main object of the settlement is to determine the amount of revenue or *sudder jumma* payable by the zemindar, and it is only with a view to ascertain what that amount should fairly be, that Government enquires into the rates of ryots' rents, and declares what rates are to be adopted in fixing the assets of settlement. The zemindar cannot certainly get a higher rent than the ryot agrees to pay at settlement, until he either proves that a higher rent is demandable under the rent law, or prevails on the ryot to agree to pay it. But there is nothing in the settlement proceedings to prevent him from exercising this right, and the Government cannot legally bind him not to exercise it. I am therefore to say that, while the actually existing rights and the present status of all ryots of the estate are to be recorded, nothing must be inserted in the record which could interfere, or seem to interfere, with the legal and prospective rights of the zemindars. It may hereafter be found necessary to regulate the enhancement of rents by the enactment of positive law; but, as things now stand, this cannot be done in the manner proposed by the Settlement Officer.

10. The fourth matter upon which the orders of Government are required is that noticed in paragraph 40 of the report. The Settlement Officer proposes to give rights of occupancy to ryots who may clear jungle after taking leases from the Deputy Collector, and the Board support the proposal by a reference to the provisions of section 8 of Regulation VII of 1822, which authorizes the Settlement Officer to give in perpetuity, or for periods determined by Government, leases of waste land belonging to a mehal under settlement, to any persons who may be willing to undertake the cultivation, assigning to the zemindars an amount equivalent to 10 *per cent.* on the amount payable by the lessees. The Lieutenant-Governor does not see why the ryots in this case should receive *less* than the law allows them. He is disposed to think that *junglebooree* leases of the kind contemplated by the section of the law above quoted, should be given for a term of 20 years in the manner described in that section. This will secure to the ryots a right of occupancy and time to profit by their labour, and yet leave the zemindars free before the expiry of the settlement (which will

probably be for 30 years) to realize enhanced rates of rent from these portions of their estates.

11. The last point for orders is the question discussed in paragraphs 41-49 of your letter, regarding the abolition of the class of village officials called *baruas*, and the discontinuance of the allowances received by them. The Lieutenant-Governor sees nothing in the duties supposed to be performed by these men to warrant their being paid out of the assets of the estate to the detriment of the zemindar. It appears that they, in many instances, do not in fact now perform any duties, and that the zemindars and a large number of the ryots wish to get rid of them. Considerable weight must also be allowed to attach to Mr. Price's opinion, after his opportunities of local enquiry, that they may unobjectionally be got rid of. On the whole, the Lieutenant-Governor thinks that, as they are not found necessary elsewhere, there is no special reason for retaining them in this estate. No allowances need therefore be made on this account.

12. The Lieutenant-Governor will now await the final report promised by the Board in your 51st paragraph.

No. 810A, dated Calcutta, the 24th December 1879.

From—R. H. WILSON, Esq., Officiating Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L.P.,

To—The Commissioner of the Burdwan Division.

WITH reference to your letter No. 1054D, dated the 11th December 1879, submitting copy of a letter* from the Collec-

* No. 598, dated 3rd December 1879.

of Midnapore, reporting on the objections raised by the proprietors of the Majnamuta estate against the re-settlement of the estate, I am desired to state that the orders already passed† regarding the condition on which grambhery allowance is to be allowed cannot be modified, and the Board see no reason for allowing or proposing in this estate a larger consolidated allowance to the proprietor than is usually granted in similar cases under the general orders of Government.

2. It will be open to the proprietors at any time to apply for partition, and any such application will be dealt with under the rules in force. The action already taken in this matter should be separately reported.

3. The only alterations in detail which the Board think it necessary to make are—(a) the omission of all provision for putwaries, Government having recently decided that in Bengal Proper the maintenance of putwaries is not to be required, and (b) an increase of the allowance to the proprietors for collection expenses in the case of resumed lakhiraj lands from 10 to 15 per cent.

4. These changes will necessitate a revision of table C of statement XX as shown below. The statement in the Board's office has been corrected accordingly, and the copies in your and the Collector's offices should be similarly corrected—

	1287 A. S.	1288 A. S.	1289 A. S.	1290 A. S.	1291 to 1307 A. S.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1. Assets assumed as the basis of settlement ...	2,34,281 1 2½	2,34,328 13 2½	2,34,399 5 0½	2,34,409 12 11½	2,34,517 8 11½
2. Deduct collection expenses and proprietary allowance at 30 per cent. ...	70,284 5 2	70,298 10 4½	70,319 12 8½	70,340 15 3½	70,355 4 3½
3. Remainder ...	1,63,996 12 0½	1,64,030 2 10½	1,64,079 8 4½	1,64,128 13 8½	1,64,162 4 8½
4. Add half rental assessment of resumed rent-free lands 25,252-8-7½
5. Deduct collection expenses at 15 per cent. 3,787-14-1...
6. Remainder 21,464-10-6½
7. Add to avoid fractions 0-5-5½	21,465 0 0	21,465 0 0	21,465 0 0	21,465 0 0	21,465 0 0
8. Total ...	1,85,461 12 0½	1,85,495 2 0½	1,85,544 8 4½	1,85,593 13 8½	1,85,627 4 8½
9. Add or deduct to avoid fractions...	0 3 11½	0 2 10½	0 7 7½	0 2 3½	0 4 8½
10. Remainder or net revenue of Government ...	1,85,462 0 0	1,85,495 0 0	1,85,545 0 0	1,85,594 0 0	1,85,627 0 0

† See page 144, Part III, of this volume of Selections.

5. The net revenue demandable having thus been fixed at Rs. 1,85,462, the Collector should make a formal offer of the settlement to the proprietor from the beginning of 1880-81. In making this offer he should call upon them, in the event of their being unwilling to accept the settlement, subject to this amount of revenue, to state under clause 3, section 5, Regulation VII of 1822, the highest amount of jumma for the payment of which they may be willing to engage. A reasonable time should be fixed within which a reply is to be given. If no definite reply be received by that date, the proprietors must be understood to have refused, and the estate can then be brought under khas management under section 3, Regulation VII of 1822. The result of the offer should be reported to the Board, and proposals made as to the rate of malikana to be allowed under section 5, Regulation VII of 1822.

No. 342A, dated Calcutta, 5th April 1882.

From—H. J. S. CORRON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
Lower Provinces,

To—The Collector of Midnapore.

WITH reference to the accompanying extract, paragraph 5, of Board's letter No. 810A, dated the 24th December 1879, to the address of the Commissioner of Burdwan, I am directed to request that you will report categorically, as soon as possible, direct to the Board, whether the orders therein conveyed, to make a formal offer of the settlement to the proprietors of the Majnamuta estate from the beginning of 1880-81, and to call upon them, in the event of their being unwilling to accept the settlement, to state, under clause 3, section V of Regulation VII of 1822, the highest amount of jumma for the payment of which they might be willing to engage, were carried out, and, if so, with what result.

No. 15K, dated Midnapore, 10th April 1882.

From—R. H. WILSON, Esq., Collector of Midnapore,
To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

IN reply to your letter No. 342A, dated the 5th April, I have the

	Share. As. G. K. K.	honour to report that on receipt of the Board's No. 810A, dated 24th December 1879, a notice embodying the orders therein conveyed was served upon the proprietors of the Majnamuta estate as noted in the margin.
1. Baboo Mukunda Lal Roy and Murari Lal Roy	3 11 1 1	
2. Srimati Brahmamayi and the minors of Maisadul	3 11 1 1	
3. Srimati Satyabhama	3 11 1 1	
4. " Ram Mohini Debi	2 13 1 1	
5. " Kajrani Dasi and others	1 6 1 1	
6. Baboo Bhubun Chundra Banerjee and others	0 13 0 2	
7. " Grish Chandra Maiti	0 13 0 2	

2. In reply, the petitions summarized in the appendix to this letter were addressed to the Collector. The remaining proprietors made no reply.

Summary of the petitions of the proprietors of the Majnamuta state addressed to the Collector.

1st.—That most of the ryots of the Majnamuta estate have not signed the jumwabundi of the enhanced rates of rent, and until the enhanced rent is realized by Government without any objection they cannot accept the settlement.

2nd.—That the collection charges have been reduced from Rs. 35 to Rs. 30 per cent., and that owing to the defalcation of the ryots in payment of their rents they will be put to much inconvenience and loss.

3rd.—That they used to get Rs. 5 per cent. for repairing the grambaries before, while in the recent settlement the expenditure will be paid by Government after the work is completed by them. This being a professional work they cannot take the responsibility of this work.

That only 3 annas, 11 gundas, 1 cowrie, and 1 cranti share of Rani Satyabhama in pergunnah Doro and Naruamuta was purchased in a civil court decree by the Mysadul ward's estate. As the enhanced rent is not realized by Government it will be very unsafe to take the settlement at this time. If, however, the other proprietors express their willingness, he will also make arrangements to do the needful.

Petition of Baboos
Makunda Lall Roy and
Murari Lall Roy.

Petition of Mr. Deveria,
Manager of the Mysadul
estate.

No. 191A, dated Calcutta, the 19th April 1882.

From—H. J. S. CORRON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L.P.,
To—The Commissioner of the Burdwan Division.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 867, dated 25th February 1882, asking for instructions regarding the payment of malikana to the proprietors of the Majnamuta estate in the district of Midnapore.

2. In reply I am to say that the estate was brought under khas management in 1875 for five years, under section 4 of Regulation IX of 1825, in consequence of the proprietors having failed to pay the Government revenue due thereon. The term of khas management expired in March 1880. In the meantime the re-settlement of the estate was completed, and the proprietors invited to engage at the enhanced revenue fixed at the re-settlement. On their refusal to accept the re-settlement, it was proposed, in your predecessor's letter No. 1054, dated 11th December 1879, to extend the term of the khas management of the estate for two years from March 1880. The Board then, in paragraph 5 of their letter No. 810A, dated 24th December 1879, directed the Collector to make a formal offer of the settlement to the proprietors of the estate from the beginning of 1880-81, and, in the event of the proprietors refusing to accept the settlement, the Collector was instructed to call upon them, under clause 3, section V, Regulation VII of 1822, to state the highest amount of jumma for which they might be willing to engage. The proprietors, however, when so called

upon, failed "to specify and tender any sum as aforesaid," and the estate remained under khas management.

3. Under these circumstances, I am to say that the malikana allowance should continue to be calculated from the commencement of the Amli year 1287 in September 1879 up to 31st March 1880 at 10 per cent. on the assessment of the last year of the proprietors' engagement before the estate was taken under direct management under the provisions of section 4, Regulation IX of 1825, *i.e.*, for 1874-75, but that from the 1st April 1880 the case falls under the provisions of clause 3, section V, Regulation VII of 1822. From that date the net revenue derived by Government from the mehal on account of the year preceding that in which the Collector made the requisition, that is, on account of the year 1878-79, must be taken as the sum by which the amount of malikana (not being less than five, nor more than ten, per cent. on the same) shall be adjusted.

4. The Board are pleased to direct that the malikana allowance shall be calculated at the maximum rate, *i.e.*, at 10 per cent. on the net jumma realized by Government in the year 1878-79.

5. These orders must be considered to have retrospective effect, and any payments which may already have been made must be adjusted in accordance with them. The exact amount payable should be reported for the information of the Board.

No. 239, dated Chinsurah, the 5th June 1882.

Endorsed by—J. BEAMES, Esq., Commissioner of Burdwan.

Copy forwarded to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces, for instructions, with reference to his No. 191A of the 19th April last.

2. The suggestion of the Collector appears to me judicious, and is recommended for approval of the Board.

No. 100R, dated Midnapore, the 26th May 1882.

From—R. H. WILSON, Esq., Collector of Midnapore,
To—The Commissioner of Revenue, Burdwan Division.

With reference to your endorsement No. 65, dated 27th April 1882, I have the honour to solicit further instructions regarding the Board's order No. 191A, dated 19th April, on the subject of the malikana to be allowed to the proprietors of the Majnamuta estate.

2. Paragraph 3 of the Board's order directs that malikana shall be calculated on the net revenue derived from the mehal on account of the (financial) year 1878-79, while paragraph 4 says that it is to be calculated on the net jumma realized during the (financial) year 1878-79. These are of course two different things; and as the former of the two appears to be more exactly in conformity with the terms of Regulation VII of 1882, section 5, clause 3, it seems possible that paragraph 4 does not exactly express the Board's meaning.

3. The amount actually collected of course varies from year to year. The gross collections made during the year 1878-79 amounted to

Rs. 1,79,335-14-7, and as the cost of management was Rs. 37,391-5-7 the net collections made during that year were Rs. 1,41,944-9. But these collections were made on account of arrear as well as current demand, and were not therefore all made on account of the year 1878-79.

4. On the other hand, as the Amli year runs in the estate it would at any time be difficult to arrive at the exact amount collected on account of the financial year 1878-79, and if the Amli year 1286 (October 1878 to September 1879) be taken instead of the financial year 1878-79 it is not yet possible to determine the exact amount of revenue derived from the mehal on account of that year, because balances on account of that year's demand are in some cases still outstanding.

5. The total demand of the Amli year 1286 was Rs. 1,78,407-3. Whether it will ever be completely collected is doubtful, but I would propose to give the proprietors the benefit of the doubt and calculate their malikana on the total demand of the Amli year 1286 less the cost of collection during that year. This will be slightly more advantageous to Government than the mode of calculation directed in the Board's 4th paragraph, and at the same time it will apparently go as near as is practically possible towards complying with the exact terms of the law.

No. 325A, dated Calcutta, the 13th June 1882.

From—C. C. STEVENS, Esq., Offg. Secy. to the Board of Revenue, L.P.,
To—The Commissioner of Burdwan.

WITH reference to your No. 239, dated 5th June 1882, and annexure, regarding the malikana to be allowed to the proprietors of the Majnamuta estate in Midnapore, I am directed to state that the Board agree in the suggestion made by the Collector that the malikana should be calculated on the total demand of the Amli year 1286, less the cost of collection during that year, although it is evidently much more favourable to the proprietors than the law prescribes.

2. Under all the circumstances the Board have no objection to show them this consideration.

PART II.

REPORT BY THE SETTLEMENT OFFICER, MR. J. C. PRICE, ON THE REGULAR RE-SETTLEMENT OF THE JELLAMUTA ESTATE, COMPRISING TEN PERGUNNAHS.

BEFORE entering upon the details of the re-settlement, I proceed to give the history of the estate. It is said to be ascertained from certain papers which are described as the "Analysis of the Revenues of Bengal by Mr. Chief Sheristadar Grant" that the Fouzdary of Hidgellee was first dismembered from the Soobah of Orissa, and annexed to that of Bengal, in the reign of Shah Jahan. Hidgellee at that time apparently contained 28 pergunnahs, which in 1707 A.D. (or Wilaity 1114) yielded a yearly revenue of Rs. 3,41,384 exclusive of the salt mehal which was then valued at Rs. 43,565 only. Later, several accessions were made to what had come to be called the chuckla of Hidgellee, which comprised 38 pergunnahs in 1728 A.D. (1135 A.S.) all united in the single zemindari trust of Sukdeo and yet sub-divided into five portions denominated Jellamuta, Doro Dumnán, Mahisadul, Toomooluck and Sujamuta. The ausil jumma or crown rent from 1135 to 1172 A.S. (1728 to 1765 A.D.) of the chuckla of Hidgellee was Rs. 4,77,947, and the nimki or salt mehal yielded Rs. 43,365. Apparently, all five subdivisions were comprised in what was called the Circar Maljeteah.

In the margin I have given the names of the pergunnahs which

	Divisions and pergunnahs.	Ausil jumma of 1135. Rs.	
Circar Maljeteah.	I.— <i>Jellamuta (Luckhinarain)</i>		
	Pergunnah Jellamuta	36,517	1,26,509 (sic.)
	" Keotamal	55,146	
	" Decanmal	13,245	
	" Bakory	7,363	
	" Bahadurpur	11,959	
	" Gaomesli	598	
	" Noychuk bazar	958	
	" Wyhatgurra	808	
Jellamuta.	Pergunnah Balshahi	1,308	(28,025 sic.)
	" Bircool	5,928	
	" Agrsjoor	4,173	
	" Meerqoda	2,915	
Circar Maljeteah.	Bhogrye Circar Muscory	11,601	
	TOTAL OF JELLAMUTA	1,64,224	
	II.— <i>Doro Dumnán (Jadabram)</i>		
	Pergunnah Majumuta	52,919	
	" Doro Dumnán	30,461	
	" Arwamuta	15,738	
	" Kusba Hidgellee	2,136	
	" Gramleey	1,081	
	" Hoseinabad (apparently the present Nayabad)	466	
	" Debmaita (not traceable)	2,444	
	" Surifabad	4,072	
	" Amriabad	919	
	" Balijora	4,753	
	" Pataspore, Circar Muscory	9,658	
	" Shipore and Jellamuta	2,798	
Total		1,27,481 (sic.)	

constituted the two subdivisions of Jellamuta (Lakshiminarayn) and Doro Dumnán (Jadabram) which have come under re-settlement. Before going further, however, I wish to quote from a letter written on the 13th October by Mr. Crommelin, the Collector of Hidgellee, in 1812:—"Sekundar Pulwan, the elder brother of Musnund Ali Shah, who is held in the highest veneration in these parts, is said to have conquered the whole of the Hidgellee district between the years 912 and 952 Wilaity (1505 and 1545 A.D.) for his brother. After his death, which happened in 961 (1554 A.D.) Musnund Ali, who was a holy man and no warrior, understanding that the King had ordered a large force

to be sent against him, is reported in 962 (1555 A.D.) to have buried himself alive. His son Bahadoor Cawn made his peace at Court, and was regularly confirmed in the possession of the district in 963 (1556 A.D.). He had a dewan named Bheem Sen Mohapatra who had also been the dewan of his father Musnund Ali. This man had in his service Kistna Panda, a Brahmin, for his cook, and a man named Issory Patnaik, who acted as his sircar, keeping the accounts of his private expenses. Bheem Sen Mohapatra is stated at a very advanced period of life to have sunk himself with his whole family in a large tank in Bahirimuta* and on his death, Kistna Panda and Issory Putnaik, in concert with Zeil Cawn son-in-law of Musnund Ali, preferred complaints against Bahadoor Cawn to the King, who ordered him to be imprisoned about 970 (1563 A.D.). Zeil Cawn then became possessed of the district, but lost it again in 980W (1573 A.D.) in consequence of Bahadoor Cawn having regained his liberty and his authority. On the death of Bahadoor Cawn, about the year 990 (1583 A.D.), Kistna Panda and Issory Patnaik had influence enough to procure grants from the King, respectively, of certain pergunnahs in the district, which (probably with some trifling variations) now form the separate zemindaries of Jellamuta and Majnamuta."

* A permanently-settled
pergunnah in Hidgellee.

2. The foregoing remarks, as will be observed, do apply exclusively to the estates under report. What follows, however, is peculiar to Jellamuta. In writing on the Jellamuta estate, Mr. Bayley in 1844 stated that the district (Hidgellee) was formerly under the local

Gaomesh.
Eriach.
Bhograi.
Khalsi Bhograi.
Kalindi Balshai.
Barnda Bazar.
Nayabad.
Paharpore.
Bisuan.
Jellamuta.

Government of Hooghly. The Mahrattas took possession in 1155-56 A.S. (1747-48 A.D.); but in 1177 A.S. (1769-70 A.D.) the district again reverted to its former dependence upon Hooghly. In 1178 A.S. (1771 A.D.) it came into the possession of our Government. The property in the pergunnahs noted in the margin appears

from a genealogical table in the Collectorate to have descended from Kistna Panda in 990 A.S. (1583 A.D.) to Pune Choudhry, then to Gopal Choudhry, who became zemindar from 1101 to 1141 A.S. (1693 to 1734 A.D.). After his death his nephew, Lakshi Narayan Choudhry became proprietor from 1142 to 1171 A.S. (1735 to 1764 A.D.). He was succeeded by his son Birnarayan Roy, who lived from 1172 to 1187 A.S. (1765 to 1782 A.D.); he in time was succeeded by his son Naranarayan Roy, who maintained possession from 1190 to 1246 A.S. (1783 to 1839 A.D.). His eldest son of the age of 12 years, Krishna Sundar Narayan Roy, succeeded him and was the zemindar under the guardianship of his mother, Rani Krishna Priya, when Mr. Bayley wrote in 1844.

3. The British acquisition of the country dates, as I have written above, from 1178 A.S. (1771 A.D.) from that year till 1208 A.S. (1801 A.D.). The 13 pergunnahs of Keoramal, which is only another designation of the estate Jellamuta, were farmed. In 1208 A.S. (1801 A.D.) a permanent settlement of Bahirimuta, Bhaigurh,

and Dacanmal, and the other ten pergunnahs was offered to Raya Naranarayan Roy by the Collector and Salt Agent of Hidgellee, and accepted by him only with reference to the three specially mentioned pergunnahs, the remaining 10 being leased in detached farms till 1230 A.S. (1823 A.D.) to the former renters whose management had long redounded, it was said, to the advantage both of the inhabitants and of the State. During this period of farms, malikana at the rate of 10 per cent. on the net collections was paid to the zemindar. Subsequent to this, in accordance with the request of the proprietor, Mr. Wyatt, the Collector of Hidgellee effected a temporary settlement of the 10 pergunnahs which lasted till 1235 A.S. (1828 A.D.). This settlement was prolonged for an additional term of five years reaching down to 1240 A.S. (1833 A.D.), the year of the great inundation. The jumma of these temporary settlements amounted to Company's Rs. 1,12,009-13-8, the malikana being reduced from 10 to $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., because the zemindar was considered to be in very affluent circumstances, because the assessment was considered light, and because the authorities considered it necessary to maintain the jumma at the amount realized during the farming period. In 1240 A.S. (1833 A.D.) the sea spread over the Hidgellee district by which 596 villages were flooded and 12,223 houses destroyed, and 2,967 human beings and 8,232 head of cattle perished. In 1241 A.S. (1834) the district was visited by a severe storm which caused the rivers to overflow their banks, and to do extensive injury to the crops. Large remissions of revenue were granted, and the estate was kept under khas management for that year, to be followed by a temporary settlement extending to 1249 A.S. (1842 A.D.). In the meantime inundation and drought successively for four years, 1242 A.S. (1835 A.D.), 1244 A.S. (1837 A.D.), 1245 A.S. (1838 A.D.), and 1248 A.S. (1841 A.D.), afflicted the estate, and large remissions of Government revenue were made. The property was then allowed to remain in the hands of Rani Krishna Priya on the strange condition that she should make all future payments of revenue on the basis of a settlement which it was in contemplation to effect under the provisions of Regulation VII of 1822. In the year 1243 A.S. (1836 A.D.) a proposal was made to bring the estate again under khas management; considerable damage had been caused to the property owing to the proprietors having neglected the repairs of the interior embankments called grampherries. However, on Rani Krishna Priya's earnest solicitation, Mr. Mills, the Commissioner, decided that it would be more conducive to the prosperity of the estate and the maintenance of the interests of Government to extend khas management which had always failed in Hidgellee. After this, steps were taken under Mr. Grote, the Superintendent of Settlement in Midnapore, to measure and settle the whole estate. Mr. Grote did not stay in India to finish the work, which was taken up and completed by Mr. Bayley, who in 1844 submitted his final reports on the 10 pergunnahs of Jellamuta.

4. These 10 pergunnahs were found to contain an area of 152,656 acres, or 287,062 local bighas, inclusive of jalpai, land in the occupation of the Salt Agent. The real area of the estate after

deduction of the area of the Sudder Mehals borne on the towjih, the nankar and the jalpai lands was 195,581*l*. 13*c*. 8*b*. (local bighas). The jumma assessed thereon amounted to Rs. 1,67,863-13-11½. After deduction of 35 per cent. as malikana and collection expenses, and after deduction of an additional 5 per cent. to cover expenses on account of repairs of embankments and to compensate for the great liabilities to risks from drought and inundation, the revenue payable to Government amounted to Rs. 98,248-1-0½. From this sum there was to be deducted the wages of the pulbandi paiks, police paiks, and chowkidars, and any other items which the extension of the half rental assessment and the result of the appeals to the Special Commissioner would occasion. It should be remembered that Rs. 48,019-10-5¼ of the new assessment were derived purely from resumptions, a source which contributed nothing to the older jummas. The real difference between the proceedings of 1845 and the older settlements, lay in the inequality of the allowances to the proprietor; 6½ per cent. were fixed as malikana before 1845, whereas 40 per cent. were generally allowed after that year.

		Rs.	A.	G.
*1250	...	84,244	12	8½
1251	...	91,685	6	7½
1253	...	95,452	5	6½
1253	...	98,368	5	2
1254	...	98,450	14	5½
1255	...	98,491	1	0½
1256	...	98,531	11	2
1257	...	98,554	8	0½
1258 to 1274	...	98,559	15	10½

		Rs.	A.	G.	C.
1208 to 1216	...				
1217	...	1,06,819	2	12	0
1218	...	1,01,095	1	19	2
1219	...				
1220	...	1,01,101	10	16	3
1221	...	68,659	7	1	0
1222	...				
1223	...	1,00,842	14	9	1
1224	...	1,06,747	4	17	1
1225	...	1,04,155	1	1	2
1226	...	1,04,470	7	17	2
1227	...	1,06,301	9	10	2
1228	...	1,03,433	4	15	3
1229	...	1,03,710	5	16	2
1230	...	97,811	12	3	1

Regarding the jumma of 1845, Mr. Bayley wrote: "I do not mean to say that the estate cannot yield a higher jumma under the moderate assessment now imposed on it; it will doubtless recover itself, but it will take time to do so; and, on the whole, I am of opinion that the mehal is fairly assessed." At the same time I cannot refrain from observing that the jumma fixed by Mr. Bayley* is less than the actual collections of every year, from 1208 to 1230 A.S. (1801 to 1823 A.D.), including those of the latter year which amount to Rs. 97,811-12-3 in sicca rupees. The collections of 1217 and 1244 (1810 and 1837 A.D.) were Rs. 1,06,819-2-12*g*s. and Rs. 1,06,047 in sicca rupees respectively. The collections from 1208 to 1230 A.S. (1801 to 1823 A.D.) are given in the margin.

5. Some information regarding the statistics of the estate as ascertained by Mr. Bayley is now given. The number of villages in the entire estate was 513, the population being 36,691, of which number 29,564 were Hindus and the rest Mahomedans. The population was divided into 19,495 families, which number gives an average of less than two persons to each family. The rich families were 23 in number, the poor 19,472. There were only three schools in the estate in which grammar and the sacred books of the Hindus were taught. Mr. Bayley, however, adds that Persian Ooriya, and Bengalee were taught in 23 villages; that 9,251 persons could read and write; coarse cloth was the only manufacture and that

insufficient for home consumption. The land was divided into two kinds, jal producing rice, and kala (sub-divided into dhasa and sandy) producing betel, betel-nut, cocoanut, cotton, mustard, vegetables, mulberry. It is not to be supposed that these products grew in every one of the pergunnaahs; all of them were noticed in some one or more pergunnaahs.

6. The principal features of Mr. Bayley's settlement that, in my opinion, ought to be noticed by me as I write the history of the estate are these:—The existence in Jellamuta and other pergunnaahs of a vast number of embankments, the repairs of some of which, such as Hasiabundi, Jalnikashi, and Khalkhundig, constructed along the khals and large channels, the Government took upon itself leaving the interior embankments (grambheries, gramsurhabheries, and bhareebundee) to be maintained by the zemindar who habitually neglected them and allowed the cultivated land to fall out of cultivation with a view to decrease the assets of the estate at the time when settlement proceedings had to be undertaken. (2) The liability of Government to pay not only khalaria rents which were looked upon as a mal asset and were included in the revenue, but also moshahera. (3) The large area of jalpai land, 60,470*b.* 0*c.* 6*b.*, (local bighas) in this estate alone in the possession of the Salt Agent for which he paid khalaria rents to the managers for the time being of the estate. (4) The resumption and assessment at full rates of the akharajat lands, that is lands in the possession of paiks, mohurirs, and other collectors of rents for the zemindars, and held hitherto at a nominal or peshkush rent. The handsome allowance made to the proprietor in all the pergunnaahs, parts of Erinch and Gaomesh alone excepted, 40 per cent., made it incumbent on the authorities to resume these holdings. The resumption likewise of the zemindars nankar, also held at a nominal rent of the lands in the holdings of police paiks, zemindari paiks, chowkidars, pulbandi paiks, barbers, *et hoc genus omne*; henceforward to be remunerated by a money payment or pension. (5) The existence of a vast number of resumed rent-free and confirmed lakhiraj tenures, some of which latter had hitherto together with the former paid a peshkush. (6) The absence of a great many lakhirajdars, whose lands were resumed and assessed at a half rental yet who did not come forward to settle. (7) The disparity existing between the rates applied to the assessment of the mal lands and those of resumed rent-free tenures; the rates of the latter were in many instances only half the former, though superiority in productive power of the soil, if any, most unquestionably lay with the resumed lands.

8. The advancement of a great many claims to hold land at permanent or low rates. Some of which were confirmed; most rejected.

9. The authority derived apparently from usage and custom, and vested in pahi ryots (tenants-at-will) to transfer or alienate their holdings, and their non-liability to be ousted, save when in arrear.

7. Mr. Bayley's settlement of Jellamuta was to have a term of 24 years from 1250 to 1274 (1843 to 1867, A.D.) and the jumma as will have been noticed was progressive till 1258 (1851) when it reached

its maximum amount (Rs. 98,559-15-10½). In 1851 the proprietors committed default in payment of the revenue, and Mr. Bayley, who had become the Collector of the district, brought the estate under khas management, agreeably to the provisions of Act IX of 1825. This administration continued for 15 years down to the year 1865, the collections being made through the medium of farmers. In 1866 the Collector, Mr. Herschel, summarily settled the estate for one year, the conditions undergoing no change save in one particular. Hitherto the khalari rent due to the proprietors had been included in the sudder jumma, and payments made on this account used to be debited to land revenue; a sum equivalent to this khalari rent was assessed by Mr. Herschel on the waste lands of the estate, and being included in the revenue assets, was considered a set-off to the khalari rent, payment of which was stopped, and the jumma therefore suffered no change. The proprietors objected very strongly to this arrangement, but were overruled.

8. In 1867, on the expiry of the term—the summary settlement—the estate was temporarily-settled for five years on the same conditions as before, pending a regular detailed re-measurement and re-assessment which was in contemplation; proceedings towards this re-settlement were not begun by me till January 1874, but as in the meantime the term of the five years' summary settlement had expired, the estate was allowed to remain in the hands of the proprietors on the same conditions as before for an indefinite period, which was to terminate with the completion of the present re-settlement proceedings.

9. What I have already written will have disclosed the cause and origin of settlement; the estate has in fact never been permanently-settled, and the reason will in some measure be apparent from a perusal of Appendix No. I, which is a quotation taken from the old records. The right of Government in the estate extends to its appropriating as Government revenue that portion of the gross assets which remains after deduction of proprietary allowance and collection expenses; these both combined generally amounting to about 30 per cent. of those assets.

BOUNDARIES OF THE ESTATE.

10. The estate comprises 10 pergunnahs of which three—Erinch—Bainda Bazar, and part (called pergunnah) of Bisuan are contained in one block; four others, Kalindi Balshai, Gaomesh, Bhograi, and Khalsa Bhograi are contained in another block; while the remaining three pergunnahs, Jellamuta, Paharpur, and Keoramal Nyabad, are quite detached from each other as well as from the rest of the estate. The boundaries of the first block are—

On the north Gumgurbh* and Sujamuta;* on the south Bahiri-muta;* on the east river Hooghly and Gumgurbh;* on the west Naruamuta.†

* Permanently-settled
pergunnahs.

† Temporary-settled per-
gunnahs of the Majna-
muta estate.

Those of the second block are—

On the north Shipore* and Majnamuta;† on the south Bay of Bengal; on the east Majnamuta;† and on the west Bircool,* Mirgoda,* and Orissa, Balshai.*

Pergunnah Jellamuta is bounded—

On the north by Mynachor,* Tumulook,* and Gumgurh;* on the south by Sujamuta,* Bhuiyamuta,* and Aranganagor;* on the east by Aranganagor* and a detached portion of Sujamuta;* on the west by Amarsi and Sabang.*

Pergunnah Paharpore is bounded—

On the north by Kismut Pataspore;† on the south by Majnamuta;† on the east by Naruamuta;† on the west by Dantamuta and Agrachor.*

* Permanently-settled
pergunnahs of the Majna
muta estate.

† Temporarily settled
pergunnahs.

Pergunnah Keoramal Nyabad is bounded—

On the north by the river Bagda; on the south by Majna Nyabad;† on the east by Bahirmuta and Bhaitgurh;* on the west by Naruamuta.†

But there are individual villages belonging to some of the pergunnahs and especially to that of Bisuan, which are altogether detached and situated at a distance from the other portions of the estate, being surrounded by the lands of the villages of other estates either temporarily or permanently-settled. The boundaries of such villages cannot and need not be given here.

(a) There were in all 18 boundary disputes where lands said to belong to the estate were claimed by the proprietors of other estates. The area of the land involved in the disputes was 745b. 6c. 7½b. of which eventually 486b. 9c. 6b. were assigned to the estate under report, the rest, 258b. 17c. 1½b., being disposed of otherwise.

SYSTEM OF MEASUREMENT.

11. The measurement of the entire estate was by a chain of 30 feet in length and a Bengalee surveying compass. The plan of each village was plotted to the scale of 32 inches to the mile. The areas of the different fields in the village area were at first computed in standard bighas was (3b. 0c. 8b.=an acre), and afterwards reduced to local bighas (1b. 17c. 10b.=an acre) to admit of the application of the local rates. The area in local bighas was noted in a separate column of the schedules (chittahs). The system of measurement adopted by the ameen was as follows:—In a village of ordinary size, say 300 or 400 bighas, the ameen began by measuring the four sides of all the fields lying on the village boundary; he took also the bearings of these sides with the aid of the Bengalee surveying compass. He then plotted on his plan the village boundary and the fields so measured. In order to secure the meeting of the two ends of the village boundary, when finally closing up, he took the lengths and bearings of several tie-lines connecting different points in the village boundary, so that errors in measurement or plotting should be kept separate and apart, being confined to the several spaces covered by these tie-lines. When finishing his circuit the ameen knew that if any error existed it was contained in the space covered by the last tie-line. In this way, as a rule, he succeeded in getting the two ends of the village boundary to meet. He then measured the interior fields, taking no bearings, and plotted them on his village plan. Under this system, undoubtedly on the first essay, it was sometimes found impracticable to fit in all the fields; the

plotting had to be commenced anew. Eventually, however, the ameens became so experienced and skilled in plotting that some of them drew plans which were marvels of accuracy and neatness. Even when they were not quite accurate, the error, if immaterial, was allowed to pass, the absolute correctness of the schedules being maintained and insisted upon. The main purpose of the plans was that no field should escape notice and be left unmeasured altogether, and therefore unplotted; the schedules formed the basis of the subsequent assessment operations.

(a) When the village was a large one, two or more artificial blocks were made of the village area and measured in the way described above. The ameen would have otherwise found it impossible to get the ends of the village boundary to approximate at all. Whatever errors have been made during the entire measurement would have all been focussed into the end; whereas, under the system of having separate blocks, the errors were dispersed and confined to particular spaces.

(b) Tests were made of the ameens' measurement in every village by the several supervising Deputy and Sub-Deputy Collectors during the three years that measurement operations were in progress. I visited every pergunnah, and made frequent tests; picked amlahs of my establishment also checked the measurement on a still more extensive scale. Besides the scientific test of circuit lines with off-sets, they tested the lengths of the sides and the areas in individual fields; ascertained whether the classification of the soil and the owner's name had been correctly recorded. In short, no precautions were omitted in this re-settlement to ensure accurate measurements.

AGGREGATE AREA OF THE ESTATE, AND AREA GAINED, AS COMPARED WITH THE FORMER AREA.

12. The area of the estate in the further settlement was 198,386*b. 2c. 2b. 16* $\frac{1}{4}$ *gds.*;^{*} in this re-settlement the area has been found to be 202,198*b. 6c. 13b. 17* $\frac{1}{4}$ *gds.*; in other words there has resulted an increase of 3,812*b. 4c. 11b. 1* $\frac{1}{4}$ *gds.* This difference I cannot explain; it is, however, insignificant and may be due to the more accurate surveys of the present day compared with the rough (khasra) measurements of 1840. For details of the area I would beg a reference to the statement A herewith annexed, showing the former and present areas, and the jummas assessed thereon in the Jellamuta estate.

* Lands taken up by the Hidrellee Tidal canal are excluded.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SOIL.

13. The land of the 10 pergunnahs comprising the estate is of two descriptions—kala or high land sub-divided into bastu (homestead) and dhasa (suitable for cold-weather crops), and jal or rice land. I may explain that no very valuable crops are produced to any appreciable extent in the dhasa land which grows only mustard, cotton, linseed, flax, brinjals, pumpkins, other native vegetables, water-melons, cocoanuts, betel-nuts, betel leaf (sparsely); biri, mulberry, and sugarcane being

almost unknown. The jal produces rice in most of the pergunnahs in most luxuriant form.

(a) Eight of the 10 pergunnahs of the estate are quite inland; pergunnah Bisuan and Kalindi Balshai border on the river Hooghly and on the Bay of Bengal, respectively, but are quite protected from salt water inundations by the great sea-dyke of Hidgellee. Two pergunnahs contain jungle—Keormal Nyabad and Paharpore—the latter to a considerable extent; but reclamation is going on, and in a few years culturable pieces of land will have been brought under the plough. All the pergunnahs are well cultivated, but particularly Jellamuta and Erinch; in the latter the best crops grow, while both have good water-carriage for their surplus produce, the latter by means of the Hidgellee tidal canal.

RENT-FREE HOLDINGS.

14. There are 2,963 confirmed rent-free holdings or tenures in the estate, assigned in the margin to the different pergunnahs to which they belong. They altogether cover an area of 27,960 <i>b.</i> 17 <i>c.</i> 1 <i>b.</i> and 19½ <i>g.</i>			The former area was 27,779 <i>b.</i> 6 <i>c.</i> 1 <i>b.</i> and 12½ <i>g.</i> ; therefore an increase of 180 <i>b.</i> 19 <i>c.</i> 0 <i>b.</i> and 17½ <i>g.</i> has resulted, but this excess is entirely owing to former defective measurements. The most careful local enquiries were made, and it was brought to light that the lakhirajdars had not encroached on the mal or revenue-paying lands lying adjacent to their tenures.		
Jellamuta	...	790			
Taraf Erinch	...	486			
Do. Bisuan	...	526			
Kalindi Balshai	...	299			
Bhograi	...	497			
Paharpore	...	220			
Khalsa Bhograi	...	104			
Keormal Nyabad	...	15			
Bainda Bazar	...	21			
Gaomesh	...	25			
Total		2,963			

LANDS NOT FIT TO BE ASSESSED AT PRESENT.

15. The area of the unassessed culturable waste in the former settlement was 5,906*b.* 4*c.* 8*b.*; it has now decreased to 409*b.* 9*c.* 1*b.* and 10*g.* The area of unassessed unculturable waste was 27,391*b.* 14*c.* 8*b.* and 6½*g.*; this also has decreased now to 22,897*b.* 14*c.* 12*b.* and 8*g.* The total extension of cultivation is represented by an area of 9,990*b.* 15*c.* 2*b.* and 8½*g.* The gerias or small ponds were not assessed in the last settlement, but in this re-settlement it was brought to light that ponds in excess of the number that existed in 1845 had been freshly excavated to the detriment of the estate, but to the advantage of the ryots who stored fish in them for their own consumption and benefit. All such gerias as had been newly excavated for any other purpose than for the absolutely necessary requirements of the ryots were accordingly brought under assessment. The total areas covered by the new gerias in the estate is 913*b.* 6*c.* 1*b.* 19½*g.*, and those that have been assessed bring in a rental of Rs. 1,141-10-0½* at the rate of Rs. 1-4 per bigha.

* In pergunnah Erinch only.

RATES.

16. In at least 8 of the 10 pergunnahs comprising the Jellamuta estate, the assessment of rates was made according to the standards prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs, a

comparison being at the same time instituted with the enhanced rates that were being proposed in the adjacent temporarily-settled pergunnahs of the Majnamuta estate which has likewise come under re-settlement. In one pergunnah, Keoramal Nyabad, which had no permanently-settled pergunnah lying adjacent to it, the assessment was based solely on calculation of outturn of produce and value thereof. The rates assessed in Keoramal Nyabad bear the same ratio to the increased productiveness of soil and enhanced value of produce as the old rates bore to the former value of produce. Nay, I should rather say that the ryot of the present day, with the enhanced value of the produce of his holding, is better off by our assessment than the ryot of 1845 was with the estimated value of the produce of that year, and the corresponding assessment. In seven of the eight pergunnahs afore-mentioned (Gaomesh being excepted) with a view of testing the fairness of the proposed rates, calculations similar to those that were made in Keoramal Nyabad regarding increased outturn of produce and enhanced value thereof were applied so far as it was possible to do so.

Unfortunately the papers of the former settlement do not in the case of all the pergunnahs give figures showing what was the estimated outturn in 1845, and its value; also the ratio that the rates assessed bore to this value. In this re-settlement in the case of pergunnah Taraf Bisuan, which has its villages scattered not only throughout the estate, but also all over the Majnamuta estate, no comparison with the rates prevailing in neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs was possible, the rates assessed for the adjacent villages of the temporarily-settled pergunnahs whether of Majnamuta or Jellamuta, wherein lay the villages of Taraf Bisuan, have been taken also for the assessment of the latter. A comparison of the rates assessed in Taraf Bisuan may fairly be made with the rate assessed in the other pergunnahs of Jellamuta, and the validity of these rates may be tested by the calculations relating to outturn of produce in Bisuan and value thereof. I have annexed to this report two

* *Vide statement B.* statements,* one showing the rates assessed in the different pergunnahs of Jellamuta, side by side with the rates prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs, and with the rates proposed for the assessment of the neighbouring pergunnahs of the Majnamuta estate also under re-settlement. The

† *Vide statement C.* other† statement gives the outturn of produce in the several pergunnahs as ascertained by actual experiment, the value thereof, the costs of cultivation, the average rate assessed, and the net profit left to the ryot. Where similar statistics are given in the papers of the former settlement they are also reproduced for the purposes of comparison. In the case of some of the pergunnahs where they are not so given, old residents, who had personal knowledge of the proceedings of 1845, were examined, but I cannot say that it is my belief that much dependence can be placed on their statements.

(a) At the outset, before the confirming revenue authorities proceed to the consideration of the rates given in the first statement,

this fact should be borne in mind that the bigha in Jellamuta is larger than the bigha in the permanently-settled pergunnahs adjacent. The rates of the permanently-settled pergunnahs given in the statement are, however, adjusted to the Jellamuta standard. They are, as a rule, much in excess of the rates proposed for the assessment of Jellamuta. The legitimate conclusion to be arrived at therefore, if the productive powers of the soil are equal in both the temporarily-settled and permanently-settled pergunnahs, is that the proposed assessment is fair and equitable, and yet none of the ryots have signed the jumma bundee, save those of two villages of 37 in pergunnah Erinch, though many showed an inclination at first to accept our assessment, till they were led away by the persuasions of some of the leading ryots who cultivate large areas in their holdings and on whom the new assessment would press with particular weight.

(b) One circumstance connected with the calculations regarding outturn of produce and value thereof requires perhaps some explanation, which, I regret to say, I cannot give to my own satisfaction; this is the great disparity in the amounts of the net profit left to the ryot in the different pergunnahs. The same disparity is noticed as having existed at the time of the last settlement, whereas Rs. 2-8 was the profit left to a ryot in Jellamuta in 1845, the ryot of Bisuan was obliged to rest content with Rs. 1-1-11 only, the disparity amounting to so much as Rs. 1-6-1—considerably more than the profit itself of the Bisuan ryot. In this re-settlement the disparity between the profit left to the ryot of Jellamuta and that of Baida Bazar amounts to Rs. 1-12-6, but the value of the produce per bigha in the latter pergunnah is only Rs. 7-4, whereas it is Rs. 9-12 in Jellamuta, and the disparity in the proposed rates is almost nil—only 6 pies; hence the Jellamuta ryot gets all the benefit of the greater productiveness of the soil of his pergunnah. In the former settlement the rate for the Baida Bazar ryot was Rs. 1-9, whereas it was only Rs. 1-4 for the Jellamuta ryot; the enhancement by the proposed rate for the former is only Re. 0-7-6, whereas it is so much as 12 annas for the latter; yet the latter has much the larger profit. There can be no doubt that in the assessment of rates any disparity in the productiveness of the soil of different pergunnahs, however slight, operates greatly to the disadvantage of the ryot of the less productive pergunnah. But this is a natural consequence—at least so I take it. Of two pergunnahs, one very productive and the other only moderately so, an assessment of rates, however equitable, must be relatively much more lenient or less of a burden on the ryot of the more fertile pergunnah than on the ryot of the less fertile pergunnah.

(c) Calculations of outturn and value of produce have been possible for the most part only in connection with rice land; it has not been found any easy matter to discover a ground for the enhancement of rates for high land (dhasa) on account of increased productiveness. But there is no reason why the rates prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs should not be introduced in Jellamuta for both high land (dhasa) and homestead (bastu), and I am assured that the ryots, if they accepted the enhanced rates for rice land, would not

object to the rates for dhasa and bastu. That the value of land of every description has vastly increased since the time of the last settlement there is no reason to doubt; the ryots now enjoy almost perfect immunity from the disastrous effects of storm-waves and salt-water inundations; so complete is the system of embankments constructed and maintained at great cost by Government in Hidgellee. The drainage also, except in Jellamuta pergunnah, is all that could be desired; the ryots may suffer occasionally from drought, but never from inundations either of fresh or salt-water.

BUNKUR.

17. There is no revenue derived from woods or groves.

FISHERIES.

18. The revenue derived from 46 fisheries assessed throughout the estate is Rs. 238-5-5½ as compared with Rs. 187-1-3¼, the figures of the last settlement. But the Commissioner has expressed an opinion

Vide paragraph 3 of his letters Nos. 886 and 902, dated 5th and 14th February 1878, respectively.

that the revenue of Rs. 131 derived from two sea fisheries should be abandoned on the ground of their being sea fisheries. I need hardly add that on consideration I have felt constrained to concur in opinion with the Commissioner, though the assessment of the two fisheries has come down to us from the last settlement and has been acquiesced in by the zemindars.

DIFFERENT CLASSES OF RYOTS.

19. There are three classes of ryots in the estate; 18,568 khoo-khast or resident ryots, 15,398 paikast

18,568	cultivating	80,097-6-2-0¼.
15,398	"	38,693-3-0-9¼.
696	"	2,979-1-0-17¼.

or non-resident ryots who have been in possession of their holdings for more than 12 years; both these classes enjoy rights of occupancy; and 696 non-resident ryots who have not been in possession for 12 years and who have no rights of occupancy. The jumma of no class of ryots can be enhanced during the term of re-settlement; so long as a ryot even of the 3rd class pays his rents he cannot be ousted by the zemindars, and even when he is ousted it can only be after legal proceedings and with the court's sanction. The ryots possess those rights which either they have always exercised, and which have come down to them from the last settlement (the privilege of selling or otherwise transferring their holdings being one of them), or rights which have accrued to them by distinct legal enactment. So that the zemindars who are entitled to re-settlement cannot

Vide his letter No. 370, dated 16th July 1877, on the re-settlement of Saifabad, a pergunnah of the Majumuta estate.

dispute the status of the ryots hereinbefore described. However, the transferable right of the ryots of Hidgellee, both resident and non-resident, in their holdings, was called in question by the Commissioner as opposed to the orders of the Government of India. But under the circumstances represented in my

letter No. 203 of the 26th July 1877, the long established—I might almost say—hereditary rights of the ryots throughout the pergunnahs in Ilidgellee cannot now be contested in a court of law.

RENT ROLL.

20. The statement A annexed to this report gives the proposed gross assets compared with the former gross assets. The increase or decrease in the assets on account of each kind of land is also given. The increase by the proposed re-settlement amounts to Rs. 93,024-2-1½ in total gross assets, which were Rs. 1,50,747-6-8½ and have now become Rs. 2,44,790-10-8.

NUMBER OF INHABITANTS.

21. There are in the estate 30,898 men, 31,292 women, 15,439 boys under 12 years of age, 12,267 girls under 12 years of age. There are 37,733 cows, 287 buffaloes, 392 horses and ponies, 1,760 sheep, 2,548 goats, 3 elephants, and 3 camels.

RESUMPTION OF RENT-FREE HOLDINGS.

22. No proceedings were taken in this re-settlement to resume rent-free lands. There are 3,323 petty, formerly resumed rent-free, holdings or tenures in the estate assigned in the margin to the different pergunnahs to which they belong. They altogether cover an area of 27,412*b.* 15*c.* 13*b.* and 19½*g.*, yielding a half-rental of Rs. 9,476-6-6½. The former area was 28,017*b.* 8*c.* 15*b.* and 0½*g.* assessed in 1844 with a half rental assessment of Rs. 9,386-0-10¼: a decrease of 604*b.* 9*c.* 1*b.* and 9*g.* in the former area and an increase of Rs 90-5-8½ in the half rental assessment have resulted. The decrease in area is attributable solely to the incorrectness of the former measurements. The increase over the former half rental assessment represents the half rental assessed on such petty resumed rent-free tenures as were un-assessed, because found uncultivated at the time of the last settlement. The assessment has been made strictly in accordance with the provisions of Board's circular No. 6 of January 1866.

Jellamuta	1,327
Taraf Erinch	293
" Bisuan	347
Kalindi Balshui	358
Bhograi	585
Paharpore	245
Khal-a Bhograi	97
Keoraml Nyabad	9
Baird. Bazar	14
Gaomesh	48
Total	3,323

BARUAS AND PUTWARIES.

23. The number of baruas entertained in the estate by the conditions of the last settlement is 391 (*vide* statement D annexed). The amount of remuneration was Rs. 1,578-3-0. The proposed number of baruas or village headman is 392, and their proposed remuneration Rs. 1,679-15. My views of the subject of baruas are contained in my letter No. 394, dated 29th March last, to the Commissioner. For the reasons therein stated, I would recommended their abolition; their

chief fault lay in obstructiveness to the present re-settlement proceedings, and in inducing the general body of ryots to oppose our assessments. There were no putwaries in Jellamuta according to the terms of the last settlement. I have proposed to employ 60 putwaries at a cost of Rs. 3,600 yearly (*vide* statement E annexed).

GRAMBHERIES.

24. The Government has ruled (*vide* marginal note) that the ryots

No. 2878, dated 5th July 1872, received with Commissioner's memorandum No 325, dated 14th August 1872.

are bound to keep in proper repair the gram-bheries in the estate. These gram-bheries are absolutely necessary for cultivation. In the former settlement, in 6 pergunnahts 5 per cent. of the gross assets were granted to the zemindars for the express purpose of constructing and repairing gram-bheries. The allowance amounted to Rs. 7,000* in the entire estate. The zemindars have consistently neglected this obligation, and the ryots are most unwilling now to take it upon themselves. In accordance with Government ruling the gram-bheries allowance previously granted to the zemindars is withdrawn in this re-settlement; but as the ryots firmly decline to be made liable for the repairs, and will not take pottahs in which the obligation is inserted, the revenue authorities will have to decide how it is to be made legally binding on them. In the re-settlement proceedings it has been recorded what gram-bheries or gram-bheries are to be repaired by the ryots of a particular village it was found impracticable to specify. What gram-bheries should be repaired by individual ryots. Gram-bheries for the most part are constructed on the boundary of two conterminous villages, and help to retain the water necessary for the cultivation of the fields of both villages. They are also used as footpaths for cattle going to pasture, and generally for passengers moving from one village to another.

* This amount is approximate. The 5 per cent. on account of gram-bheries allowance was included in the 40 per cent. of gross assets allowed to the proprietor.

DRAINAGE CHANNELS.

25. The zemindars are bound, also under the Government ruling quoted above, to keep in proper repair the interior drainage channels in the estate. This duty also they have always neglected; but if they take settlement, a clause will be inserted in the pottah to be granted to them, making it obligatory on them to provide for and maintain the efficient drainage of the estate.

PARTIES ENTITLED TO SETTLEMENT.

26. The rights belonging to each class of tenants on the estate have been set forth in the preceding paragraph; that these rights are beyond dispute has also been shown. Whatever party takes settlement, be it the zemindars (at present the two ladies noted in the margin) or an outsider, the collection of rents will have to be made during the term of settlement that will hereafter be sanctioned strictly according to the jumabundee made by the settlement department. No enhancement

Rani Hari Priya.
" Anandamayi.

of rents will be allowed during that term. It would be well in this place to show how the two aforementioned ladies have succeeded to the possession of the estate. The last settlement was made with Rani Krishna Priya. On her death the zemindari devolved on Krishna Indra Narayan's younger brother. Kunwar Narayan obtained a decree for a moiety in the zemindari and took possession accordingly. The former died, leaving his son Gajendra Narayan, and the latter died, leaving his wife, Hari Priya, to succeed to the property. Gajendra Narayan died lately, leaving his wife, Anandamayi, to succeed to his share in the property. Hari Priya and Anandamayi Debi have therefore been called upon to take the re-settlement; they do not absolutely decline it; they say that the former rate of their malikana and collection charges has now been greatly reduced, whereas the jumma has been considerably enhanced. They cannot make up their minds either to agree to or to decline the re-settlement until they have got copies of all the papers. That no malikana is deducted in their favour from the half rental assessment of petty resumed rent-free tenures, but only 10 per cent. has been allowed on account of collection charges. They say they should have full authority to oust defaulting ryots summarily, and to realize arrear rents by summary distraint and sale of their property. These objections and particularly the final request are most unreasonable and utterly unworthy of consideration. They do not name any jumma which they are willing to pay for their estate, though they were expressly invited to give expression to their opinions regarding this point.

COLLECTION EXPENSES AND MALIKANA.

27. The collection expenses have been calculated at 10 per cent.

Vide clause 2, paragraph 10, section IX, Chapter XX of the Board's Rules.

No. 1021, dated 13th March 1878, on the settlement of the mal jalpai lands of Bhograi and two other pergunnahs.

of the assets after deduction of baruas' and patuaries' remuneration; the malikana at 20 per cent. When proprietors take settlement according to the rule noted in the margin, a consolidated allowance of 30 per cent. should be deducted from the gross assets, but in deference to the Commissioner's orders marginally noted, I have made two separate deductions on account of collection expenses and malikana. The net maximum Government revenue becomes Rs. 1,74,117, or Rs. 74,889-8 in excess of the revenue of the former settlement, which was Rs. 99,227-8 (*vide* statement No. XX).

TERM OF SETTLEMENT.

28. The term of re-settlement will extend to 1900 A.D., the year fixed for the expiry of all settlements in the Burdwan Division.

J. C. PRICE,

Offg. Settlement Officer, Midnapore.

APPENDIX No. I.

Extract from a letter written by W. N. W. HEWITT, Esq., Collector of Hidgellee Depôt, to THOMAS CALVERT, Esq., Collector of the Salt Districts,—(dated Contai, 4th December 1787).

It is estimated by the zemindari and kanungo amlah that three-fourths of the ryots of the Hidgellee chuckla stand in the double capacity of ryot and ajoorah molungees; hence it is that since the first conquest of the chuckla by Taj Khan Musnund Ali in the year 912 Wilaity, and through every succeeding Government, it has been held khas to preclude, I imagine, the operation of a double authority over the ryot-molungees, and by fixing every demand upon them in the same hands, it furnished the power of making each call with strict attention to the effect it might produce upon the other, at the same time that it secured to Government the full labour of the molungees, and, as it regards the relative situation of the zemindar and the ryots, the complete revenue of the ryot. It may not be out of place to mention here that the present zemindari are not the ancient hereditary landholders. The first introduction of the ancestors of the zemindars of Keoramal and Majnamuta was with Bheem Sen Mohapatra, Dewan to Musnund Ali. Beernarain is descended from the russooa Brahmin of Mohapatra, and the late Koernarain from Mohapatra's khanji navisundah. The districts were farmed to the zemindars as izardars or farmers for the year 86, 87, and 88 Wilaity, in which period they accumulated a balance of upwards of a lakh of rupees; but on the establishment of the khas soubats in 1189 Wilaity (when the Company took the manufacture and sales into their own hands) the districts of this chuckla again reverted to the ancient and customary usage of being held khas and have continued on the same footing ever since.

No. XX.—Abstract of information relative to the assessment

1	2	3	UNASSESSED AREA.			
	Extent in bighas.	Extent in acres.	Forest, jungle, and waste. a.	Site of village, roads, tanks, and lands otherwise incapable of cultivation. b.	Rent free. c.	Service. d.
1. By last measure- ment	1,98,646 15 1 16½	1,04,250 1 28	5,906 4 8 0	27,391 14 8 6½	27,779 6 1 12½
2. By recent mea- surement	2,02,198 6 13 17½	1,07,458 0 31	409 9 1 10	22,897 14 12 8	27,960 17 1 19½

A.—Particulars of Rent-free

1	2	3	4
NAMES OF HOLDERS.	DESCRIPTION OF		
	Devatra.	Brahmatra.	Piratra.
	16,645 12 3 11	9,047 17 10 14½	1,069 0 11 10

B.—Occupation

1	2	3	4	5	6
Area and description of dif- ferent kinds of soil recog- nized in the neighbourhoo- d by marked distinctions.	Rate per bicha of each sort.	Bighas.	Acres.	Rent for 1281.	1285.
Bastu (homestead)	1,474 9 8 10½	782 3 30	6,186 2 6½	..
Dhasa	13,874 8 4 18	10,031 2 28	39,004 12 2½	..
Total kala	20,348 17 13 8½	10,814 2 18	46,090 14 9	..
Jal	97,631 15 9 11½	51,896 1 38	1,75,518 10 11½	..
Total kala and jal	1,17,980 13 7 0½	62,711 0 16	2,21,609 9 8½	..
Geria	913 6 1 19½	484 3 35	1,141 10 0½	..
Total	1,18,893 19 8 19½	63,196 0 11	2,22,751 3 8½	..
Resumed rent-free lands de- clared to be mal owing to the absence of the proprie- tors to come forward and take settlement.	2,503 15 14 0½	1,329 2 20	4,441 6 6½	..
Total	1,21,397 15 7 0½	64,525 2 31	2,27,392 10 3½	2,27,582 14 3½
Culturable waste assessed with full rates.	279 8 15 0	148 3 24	190 4 0½	..
Culturable waste assessed with progressively increas- ing rates.	667 3 10 0	355 1 11	201 0 0	201 0 0
Total waste assessed...	946 12 9 0	504 0 35	391 4 0½	..
Total	1,22,344 8 0 0½	65,029 3 26	2,27,783 14 3½	2,27,783 14 3½
Jungleboores	748 16 3 10	398 3 38	363 4 11	363 4 11
Total	1,23,093 4 3 10½	65,428 3 24	2,28,147 3 2½	2,28,147 3 2½
Deduct to avoid fractions	12 3 12	12 3 12
Remainder	2,28,135 0 1½	2,28,135 0 1½
Peshkuah	6,501 9 9½	6,501 9 9½
Jalkar	238 5 5½	238 5 5½
Total	1,23,093 4 3 10½	65,428 3 24	2,34,674 15 4½	2,34,674 15 4½
Cultivated khas patit	424 6 12 10	226 0 14	404 10 16	404 10 16
Half rental resumed rent- free.	27,412 15 13 18½	13,744 3 37	9,476 6 6½	9,476 6 6½
Total	1,50,930 6 14 0	79,399 3 35	2,44,556 0 9	2,44,556 0 9

of Jellamuta Estate, District Midnapore.

1	4			5	6	7
	ASSESSED AREA.			Former revenue.	Former rent-roll.	Former actual collections.
	Total Cols. a--d.	Cultivated and fallow.	Cultivable, not cultivated.			
e.	a.	b.	c.			
61,077 5 1 18½	1,35,658 10 3 7½	1,910 19 12 10	1,37,569 9 15 17½	Rs. A. P. 1,50,747 6 8½	Rs. A. P. 99,227 8 0	Rs. A. P.
51,268 0 15 17½	1,49,983 13 5 0	946 12 9 0	1,50,930 5 14 0

Lands from heading 3 (c).

5	6	7	9	10	
TENURES.		Ganakattar.	Mahatran.	Total.	REMARKS.
Bhattatatar.	Baishnubtra.				
2 14 8	350 1 9 4	25 11 3	819 9 4	27,960 17 1 19½	State the regulation under which the tenure is released.

of Lands.

7	8	9	10	11	12
1286.	1287.	1288.	1289.	1290.	1291 to 1307.
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
2,27,582 14 3½	2,27,582 14 3½	2,27,582 14 3½	2,27,582 14 3½	2,27,582 14 3½	2,27,582 14 3½
207 5 0	243 12 0	270 3 0	360 0 0	428 14 0	435 9 11
.....
2,27,790 3 3½ 363 4 11	2,27,826 14 3½ 363 4 11	2,27,853 1 3½ 363 4 11	2,27,942 14 3½ 363 4 11	2,28,011 12 3½ 363 4 11	2,28,018 8 2½ 363 4 11
2,28,153 8 2½ 12 3 1½ 1,28,141 5 1½ 6,539 15 3	2,28,190 3 2½ 12 3 1½ 2,28,178 0 1½ 6,530 15 3	2,28,216 6 2½ 12 3 1½ 2,28,204 3 1½ 6,539 15 3	2,28,306 3 2½ 12 3 1½ 2,28,204 0 1½ 6,539 15 3	2,28,375 1 2½ 12 3 1½ 2,28,362 14 1½ 6,539 15 3	2,28,381 13 1½ 12 3 1½ 2,28,369 10 0½ 6,539 15 3
2,34,681 4 4½ 404 10 10 9,476 6 6½	2,34,717 15 4½ 404 10 10 9,476 6 6½	2,34,744 2 4½ 404 10 10 9,476 6 6½	2,34,833 15 4½ 404 10 10 9,476 6 6½	2,34,902 13 4½ 404 10 10 9,476 6 6½	2,34,909 9 3½ 404 10 10 9,476 6 6½
2,44,562 5 9	2,44,599 0 9	2,44,625 3 9	2,44,715 0 9	2,44,783 14 9	2,44,790 10 8

C.—Analysis of

	1284.	1285.	1286.
1. Assets assumed as the basis of settlement	2,34,674 15 4½	2,34,674 15 4½	2,34,681 4 4½
2. Deduct barua allowance 1,079 15 0
3. Deduct putwaries' salaries 3,600 0 0	5,279 15 0	5,279 15 0	5,279 15 0
4. Balance	2,29,395 0 4½	2,29,395 0 4½	2,29,401 5 4½
5. Deduct collection expenses at 20 per cent. ...	45,879 0 0	45,879 0 0	45,880 4 1½
6. Balance	1,83,516 0 4½	1,83,516 0 4½	1,83,521 1 3
7. Deduct proprietary allowance at 10 per cent. ...	18,351 9 7½	18,351 9 7½	18,352 1 9
8. Balance	1,65,164 6 9	1,65,164 6 9	1,65,168 15 6
9. Add the assessment of abadi khas paitt 404 10 10
10. Deduct proprietary allowance at 30 per cent.... .. 121 6 0
11. Balance 283 4 10
12. Add half-rental assessment of re- sumed rent-free lands 9,476 6 8½
13. Total 9,759 11 4½
14. Deduct collection expenses at 10 per cent. 975 15 6½
15. Balance 8,783 11 10	8,783 11 10	8,783 11 10	8,783 11 10
16. Total	1,73,948 2 7	1,73,948 2 7	1,73,952 11 4
17. Deduct or add to avoid fractions 0 2 7
18. Balance or total revenue	1,73,948 0 0	1,73,948 0 0	1,73,953 0 0

Revenue assessed.

1287.	1288.	1289.	1290.	1291 to 1307.
2,34,717 15 4½	2,34,744 2 4½	2,34,833 15 4½	2,34,902 13 4½	2,34,909 9 3½
.....
5,279 15 0	5,279 15 0	5,279 15 0	5,279 15 0	5,279 15 0
2,29,438 0 4½	2,29,464 3 4½	2,29,554 0 4½	2,29,622 14 4½	2,29,629 10 4½
45,887 9 7½	45,892 13 4½	45,910 12 10½	45,924 9 2½	45,925 14 10½
1,83,560 6 9	1,83,571 6 0	1,83,643 3 6	1,83,698 5 2	1,83,703 11 6
18,355 0 8	18,357 2 2	18,364 5 3	18,369 13 4	18,370 5 11
1,65,195 6 1	1,65,214 3 10	1,65,278 14 3	1,65,328 7 10	1,65,333 5 7
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
8,783 11 10	8,793 11 10	8,783 11 10	8,783 11 10	8,783 11 10
1,73,979 1 11	1,73,997 15 8	1,74,062 10 1	1,74,112 3 8	1,74,117 1 5
0 1 11	0 3 8	0 1 5
.....	0 0 4	0 5 11
1,73,979 0 0	1,73,998 0 0	1,74,063 0 0	1,74,112 0 0	1,74,117 0 0

J. C. PRICE,

Offg. Settlement Officer, Midnapore.

A.

Statement showing the former and present areas, and the jummas assessed thereon in the Jellamuta Estate.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	IN THE FORMER SETTLEMENT.		IN THE PRESENT RE-SETTLEMENT.	
	Quantity of land.	Jumma.	Quantity of land.	Jumma.
1	2	3	4	5
	B. C. D. G.	Rs. A. P.	B. C. D. G.	Rs. A. P.
Bastu (homestead)	1,025 14 5 12	2,889 6 5½	1,474 9 8 10½	6,486 2 6½
Dhasa (high land)	14,208 7 11 6½	21,614 10 3½	18,874 8 4 18	39,604 12 2½
Total kala	15,234 2 0 18½	24,504 0 9	20,348 17 13 8½	46,090 14 9
Jal (rice land)	87,895 0 2 4½	1,06,432 2 7½	97,631 15 9 11½	1,75,518 10 11½
Total kala and jal	1,03,129 2 3 3	1,30,936 3 4½	1,17,980 13 7 0½	2,21,609 9 8½
Geria (ponds)	Ponds were unassessed in the last settlement.		931 6 1 19½	1,141 10 0½
Total	1,03,129 2 3 3	1,30,936 3 4½	1,19,893 19 8 19½	2,22,751 3 8½
Resumed rent-free lands declared to be mal owing to the neglect of the proprietors to come forward and take settlement	3,518 10 2 5½	1,871 9 6½	* 2,503 15 14 0½	4,641 6 6½
Total	1,06,647 12 5 8½	1,32,807 12 10½	1,21,397 15 7 0½	2,27,392 10 3½
Assessed culturable waste	1,910 19 12 10	1,414 6 1½	946 12 9 0	625 13 11½
Total	1,08,558 12 1 18½	1,34,222 3 0½	1,22,344 8 0 0½	2,28,018 8 2½
Unassessed culturable waste ..	5,906 4 8 0	409 9 1 10
„ unculturable „ ..	27,391 14 8 6½	22,897 14 12 8
Total waste	33,297 19 0 6½	23,307 3 13 18
Total	1,41,856 11 2 5½	1,34,222 3 0½	1,45,651 11 13 19½	2,28,018 8 2½
Deduct area and jumma assessed thereon on account of lands transferred from the head of "mal" to the head of half-rental resumed called "akhrajat"	189 18 12 0	182 3 8½
Ditto ditto to the head of confirmed rent-free... ..	3 8 2 0	3 8 4½
Deduct jumma reduced by the former Superintendent of Settlement	53 8 10½
Deduct assessed area and jumma found irreconcilable	2 15 0 5	0 0 10½
Total deduction	146 1 14 5	239 5 10½

* This is not an actual decrease. In the case of pergunnah Jellamuta lands of resumed rent-free tenures declared to be mal have not been separately shown, but are included in the mal area, hence the apparent decrease in area here noticed.

† These lands were originally incorporated with the mal area, and the former settlement papers were prepared accordingly. Subsequently, they were released as rent-free, or shown as resumed rent-free akhrajat, but the former settlement papers were not rectified.

A—continued.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	IN THE FORMER SETTLEMENT.		IN THE PRESENT RE-SETTLEMENT	
	Quantity of land.	Jumma.	Quantity of land.	Jumma.
1	2	3	4	5
	B. C. B. G.	Rs. A. P.	B. C. B. G.	Rs. A. P.
Remainder	1,41,710 9 4 0½	1,33,982 13 2	1,45,651 11 13 18½	2,28,018 8 2½
Add unassessed area found irreconcilable	1 5 3 3
Total	1,41,711 14 7 3½
Junglebooree	711 17 6 0	303 4 10½	748 16 3 10	368 4 11
Total	1,42,423 11 13 3½	1,34,346 2 0½	1,46,400 8 1 8½	2,28,381 13 1½*
Peshkush	6,423 7 8	6,301 9 9½†
Total	1,40,769 9 8½	2,34,683 6 11½
Julkur	187 1 3½	238 5 5½‡
Total mal	1,42,423 11 13 3½	1,40,956 11 0½	1,46,400 8 1 8½	2,34,921 12 4½
Deduct to avoid fractions	12 8 3½
Remainder	2,34,909 9 1½§
Abadi (cultivated) khas patit	426 8 4 0	404 10 10	424 5 12 10	404 10 10
Total	1,42,850 0 1 2½	1,41,361 5 10½	1,46,824 13 13 18½	2,35,314 3 11½
Half-rental resumed rent-free	26,990 2 2 10½	8,745 6 7½	26,452 19 10 9½	8,855 15 0½
Ditto ditto akharajat	1,027 6 12 10	640 10 2½	959 16 3 10	620 7 6
Total half-rental	28,017 8 15 0½	9,386 0 10½	27,412 15 13 19½	9,476 6 6½
Total	1,70,867 9 0 4	1,50,747 6 8½	1,74,237 8 11 18	2,44,790 10 8
Confirmed rent-free	27,779 6 1 12½	27,960 17 1 19½
Total	1,98,646 15 1 10½	1,50,747 6 8½	2,02,198 6 13 17½	2,44,790 10 8
Deduct land and the jumma assessed thereon taken up by canals, &c. ...	260 12 15 0	277 5 5½
Remainder	1,98,386 2 2 16½	1,50,470 1 3½
Add khalarce rents	1,286 7 3½
Total	1,51,756 8 6½

* The peshkush jumma has decreased owing to land in some tenures having either diluviated into the sea or been otherwise lost to the estates.

† The peshkush jumma on such tenures has been either lost or proportionally reduced.

‡ From this should be deducted Rs. 131, the jumma of two sea fisheries.

§ These lands were comprised in a resumed rent-free tenure at first declared to be mal owing to the absence of the proprietors to come forward and take settlement. When the proprietors appeared subsequently they were allowed only 30 per cent. of the gross assets as mulikana. In the former papers there is no reason disclosed to show why 30 instead of 50 per cent. of the gross assets were allowed. The designation is copied from the old papers.

13.

Statement of Rates in connection with the proposed re-settlement of the Jellamuta Estate.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	Present and proposed rates in pergunnah Jellamuta of the Jellamuta estate.		Rates prevailing in the permanently-settled pergunnahs of—								Present and proposed rates in pergunnah Palahpore of the Jellamuta estate.	
	Present.	Proposed.	Mynachur.	Tumlook.	Gungurh.	Arangana-gore.	Sujamuta.	Bhuia-muta.	Amarsi.	Sabang.	Present.	Proposed.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Eastu 	4 4 3 3 11 8½ 3 10 8 3 7 5½ 3 5 2½ 2 10 8 2 9 1½ 1 10 7 1 5 0	4 8 0 4 4 0 4 0 0	4 13 0 3 11 3 1 9 8 1 7 6	7 11 0 6 11 0 6 2 0 5 2 0 4 1 0	3 12 0 3 0 0	5 5 4 5 0 0	7 0 0 6 14 0 6 19 10 6 7 9 6 6 9 6 4 8 5 15 7 5 15 0 5 11 2 5 0 8 5 4 0 5 0 0 4 11 10 4 10 8 4 9 0 4 7 11 4 6 0 4 5 0 4 2 5 4 0 0	4 10 9	4 9 0 3 4 0 3 1 3	2 0 0 2 11 0 2 10 8 2 2 3½ 2 0 0 1 13 10½ 1 5 4 1 4 0	2 0 0 2 11 0 2 10 8 2 0 0 1 13 10½ 1 5 4 1 4 0
Thasa 	1 13 10½ 1 13 10 1 13 4 1 11 6 1 9 7½ 1 8 6	2 6 0 2 4 0 2 3 0 2 2 0 2 0 0 1 13 0	4 0 9 2 15 0 1 13 0	5 2 0 4 10 0 4 1 0	4 4 3 3 15 0 2 13 10 2 10 8½ 2 4 9 2 0 4	12 13 10 12 1 0 8 13 0 6 11 6 6 2 0 2 9 0	5 3 3 4 4 3 4 2 11 4 0 10 3 15 0 3 11 0	13 0 0½ 11 8 10 9 3 10 7 3 6 6 2 2 2 2 2	3 15 9	4 9 0 1 13 6	2 0 0 1 14 0 1 13 10½ 1 11 0 1 10 0 1 9 7½	2 0 0 1 14 0 1 13 10½ 1 11 0 1 10 0 1 9 7½

[illegible]

B—continued.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	Rates prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnah of—		Rates proposed in the neighbouring temporarily-settled pergunnahs of the Majnamuta estate.				PRESENT AND PROPOSED RATES IN THE UNDERMENTIONED TEMPORARILY-SETTLED PERGUNNAHS OF THE JELLAMUTA ESTATE.					
	Dantamuta.	Egrachor.	Majnamuta.	Kismut Pataspore.	Narnamuta.	Tarat Erinch.		Tarat Bisuan.		Bainda Bazar.		
						Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Bastu ...	70 2 0 to 11 11 0	35 1 0 to 18 4 2	5 0 0 4 8 0 4 6 0 4 4 0 4 3 0 4 2 6 4 2 0 4 1 0 3 12 0 2 15 0	3 8 2	3 0 0 1 0 0	4 10 8 4 9 4 4 9 7 4 5 6 4 4 0 4 3 5 4 2 8 4 0 0 3 8 0 3 7 5 3 6 4 3 5 4 3 4 0 3 3 2 2 13 4 2 12 0 2 10 8 1 14 1 1 5 1	5 0 0 4 8 0 4 4 0 4 0 0 3 0 0 2 8 0	3 14 0 3 13 10 3 13 0 3 12 6 3 12 0 3 10 3 3 8 6 3 8 0 3 4 0 3 3 2 3 3 0 2 10 8 2 8 0 2 4 0 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 0 2 2 0 1 14 0 1 13 10 1 8 0 1 6 0 1 5 4 1 1 0 0 6 0	4 12 0 4 11 0 4 10 8 4 8 0 4 6 0 4 4 0 4 0 0 3 12 0 3 0 0 2 11 0	3 8 0 3 0 0	5 0 0 4 0 0	
Dhara ...	8 8 2 to 0 10 6	5 13 6 to 2 3 1	2 12 0 2 10 0 2 8 0 2 7 0 2 6 0	2 5 5	2 1 0 2 0 0 1 10 0 1 8 0	1 13 10 1 11 8 1 10 8 1 10 1 1 9 7	2 8 0 2 4 0 2 2 0 2 0 0 1 13 0	3 0 0 2 8 0 2 4 0 2 2 0 2 1 9	3 4 0 3 2 0 3 0 0 2 14 0 2 12 0	2 7 6 2 3 8 2 0 0	2 12 0 2 8 0	

B—continued.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	Rates prevailing in the neighbourhood permanently-settled pergunnah of—			Rates proposed in the neighbourhood permanently-settled pergunnah of—			Rates in the neighbourhood permanently-settled pergunnah of—		
	Bahirimuta.	Sujamuta.	Gungurh.	Narvamuta.	Present.	Proposed.	Bahirimuta.	Majma Nyahad.	Majmamuta.
	Rs. A. P.	R. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Bastu	The rates of the ryots are being realized according to the ulthandi system.	5 5 4 5 0 0	3 0 0 3 0 0 1 0 0	2 10 0	4 0 0 1 0 0	2 8 0	4 0 0 3 8 0	5 0 0 4 8 0 4 6 0 4 4 0 4 3 0 4 2 6 4 2 0 4 1 0 4 0 0 3 12 0 2 15 0 10 0 0 6 0
Dhassa	1 8 0 1 0 0	5 3 3 4 4 3 4 2 1 4 0 10 3 15 0 3 14 0 3 12 0 3 9 10 3 6 0 3 0 9 2 15 5 2 15 0 2 14 0 2 4 0	4 4 3 3 15 3 3 13 10 2 10 34 2 4 0 2 0 1	2 1 0 2 0 0 1 12 0 1 10 0 1 8 0 1 4 0 0 12 0	1 9 0 1 5 0 1 1 0	2 0 0 1 14 0 1 12 0 1 0 0	1 8 0 1 0 0	1 12 0 1 10 0	2 0 0 to 0 8 0
Majal	1 6 0 0 9 0	3 4 0 3 2 9 3 1 2 3 1 1 2 15 4 2 15 0 2 14 4 2 13 0 2 13 1 2 13 0 1 0 9 1 5 0	1 8 2 1 7 8 1 6 11 1 6 10 1 6 4 1 5 10 1 5 1 1 4 10 1 4 4 1 4 4 1 1 4 1 0 9 0 11 10	1 12 0 1 10 0 1 8 6 1 7 0 1 6 0 1 5 0 1 4 0 1 2 0 1 0 0 0 14 0	1 4 0 1 0 0 0 14 0 0 10 6 0 8 6	1 12 0 1 11 0 1 10 0 1 8 0 1 7 0 1 4 0	1 6 0 0 9 0	1 10 0 1 9 0 1 8 0	2 0 0 to 0 8 0

B—concluded.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND.	Present and proposed rates in the undermentioned temporarily-settled pergunnahs of the Jellamuta estate.										Rates prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs of—						Rates proposed in the neigh- bouring tem- porarily-settled pergunnah of—	
	Kaindi Balshai.		Bhograi.		Khalsa Bhograi.		Gaomesh.		Orissa Balshai.		Mirgoda.		Bircool.		Shipore.		Mainamuta.	
	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.	Present.	Proposed.		
Bastu ...	Rs. A. P. 4 10 8 to 2 0 1	Rs. A. P. 5 0 0 4 12 0 4 8 0 4 4 0 4 0 0 3 8 0 3 0 0	Rs. A. P. 2 12 9½ to 0 12 9½	Rs. A. P. 5 0 0 4 8 0 4 4 0 4 0 0 3 8 0 3 0 0	Rs. A. P. 3 5 3½ to 0 12 9	Rs. A. P. 5 0 0 4 8 0 4 4 0 4 0 0 3 8 0	Rs. A. P. 4 0 0 to 4 4 0	Rs. A. P. 16 13 0 to 2 0 0	Rs. A. P. 7 0 0 to 3 14 6	Rs. A. P. 10 0 0 to 0 10 0	Rs. A. P. 5 0 0 to 3 12 0	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Dhassa ...	2 10 8 to 1 4 0	2 12 0 2 8 0 2 4 0 2 0 0 1 12 0	2 10 7½ to 0 10 8	3 0 0 2 12 0 2 8 0 2 6 0 2 4 0 2 2 0 1 12 0 1 8 0 0 10 0 0 8 0	1 11 8½ to 0 14 10½	3 0 0 2 12 0 2 8 0 2 6 0 2 4 0 2 2 0 1 12 0 1 8 0 0 10 0 0 8 0	2 7 6 to 2 3 3	2 12 0 2 8 0 2 8 0	3 12 0 to 2 8 0	4 9 9 to 1 8 0	2 14 3 to 1 11 6	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Jail ...	1 7 5 to 0 12 1	2 4 0 2 6 0 1 14 0 1 12 0 1 10 0 1 8 0 1 6 0 1 4 0 1 0 0	1 12 9½ to 0 9 7½	2 4 0 1 14 0 1 12 0 1 8 0 1 4 0 1 0 0	1 6 1 to 0 13 6½	2 4 0 1 14 0 1 12 0 1 8 0 1 4 0 1 0 0	1 12 10 to 1 9 7	2 1 0 to 1 12 0	2 10 0 to 1 7 6	2 10 0 to 2 3 9	2 0 6 to 1 6 6	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	

C.

Statement of produce in connection with the proposed re-settlement of the Jellamuta Estate.

Number.	NAMES OF PERGUNNAHS.	Average outturn of produce ascertained in maunds of paddy.	Average price per maund of paddy.	Total value of the produce including straw.	Deduct expenses of cultivation.	Deduct proposed average rate of rent.	Total deduction.	Balance left to the ryot as net profit.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Jellamuta ...	12 0 0	0 12 0	9 12 0	3 8 0	2 0 0	5 8 0	4 4 0
2	Taraf Erinch ...	11 0 0	0 12 0	8 12 0	12 8 0	1 15 5½	4 7 5½	4 7 6½
3	Do. Bisuan ...	10 6 10	0 12 0	7 13 4	12 8 0	1 12 9	4 4 3½	3 8 7
4	Bhograi ...	10 0 0	0 12 0	8 0 0	2 8 0	1 12 9½	4 4 9½	3 11 2½
5	Kalindi Balshai ...	9 0 0	0 12 0	7 0 0	2 8 0	1 12 9	4 4 9	2 11 3
6	Paharpore ...	10 4 13½	0 12 0	8 5 3	2 8 0	1 11 7	4 3 7	4 1 8
7	Khalsa Bhograi ...	10 0 0	0 12 0	8 0 0	2 8 0	1 11 2½	4 5 2½	3 12 9½
8	Keoramal Nyabad ...	9 3½ 0	0 12 0	7 10 0	2 8 0	1 9 0	4 1 0	3 9 0
9	Bainda Bazar ...	9 0 0	0 12 0	7 4 0	2 13 0	1 15 6	4 12 6	2 7 6
10	Gaomesh*	1 14 6

Statement of produce in connection with the former settlement.

1	Jellamuta ...	12 0 0	mds. 3 per rupee.	4 12 0	1 0 0	1 4 0	2 4 0	2 8 0
2	Taraf Erinch† ...	8 0 0	0 8 0	4 8 0	1 7 6	1 2 6½	2 10 0½	1 13 11½
3	Do. Bisuan ...	9 2½ 0	mds. 3 8 per rupee.	3 12 0	1 7 0	1 3 1	2 10 1	1 1 11
4	Bhograi
5	Kalindi Balshai†
6	Paharpore ...	7 14 0	mds. 2 18 per rupee.	3 8 0	1 0 0	1 4 9½	2 4 9½	1 3 2½
7	Khalsa Bhograi‡
8	Keoramal Nyabad ...	11 8 0	0 6 0	4 7 6	1 8 0	1 4 0	2 12 0	1 11 6
9	Bainda Bazar ...	7 0 0	0 8 0	4 0 0	1 4 0	1 9 0	2 13 0	1 3 0
10	Gaomesh††

* No experiment by cutting crops was made in Gaomesh; the assessment was made according to rates prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs.

† According to the ryots' depositions.

‡ No figures are given in the papers of the former settlement.

§ Ditto ditto.

|| According to the ryots' depositions.

†† No figures are given in the papers of the former settlement.

D.

Statement of Establishment of Baruas in the Jellamuta Estate.

No.	NAMES OF PERGUNNAHS.	FORMER.		PROPOSED.		REMARKS.
		Number.	Amount of remuneration.	Number.	Amount of remuneration.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	
1	Jellamuta	110	202 0 0	110	303 12 0	
2	Taraf Erinch	62	475 0 0	62	475 0 0	
3	Do. Bisuan	97	319 8 0	100	319 8 0	
4	Kalindi Balshai	23	158 8 0	23	158 8 0	
5	Puharpore	31	133 4 0	29	133 4 0	
6	Bhograi	41	150 7 0	41	150 7 0	
7	Khalsa Bhograi... ..	13	43 0 0	13	43 0 0	
8	Bainda Bazar	4	30 0 0	4	30 0 0	
9	Keoramal Nyabad	8	34 0 0	8	34 0 0	
10	Gaomesh	2	32 8 0	2	32 8 0	
	Total ...	391	1,578 3 0	392	1,679 15 0	

E.

Statement of Establishment of Putwaries proposed to be entertained in the Jellamuta Estate.

No.	NAMES OF PERGUNNAHS.	Number of putwaries.	Rate of monthly salary.	Amount of yearly salary.	REMARKS.
1	2	3	4	5	6
			Rs.	Rs.	
1	Jellamuta	15	5	900	
2	Taraf Erinch	15	5	900	
3	Do. Bisuan	15	5	900	
4	Kalindi Balshai	5	5	300	
5	Puharpore	3	5	180	
6	Bhograi	5	5	300	
7	Khalsa Bhograi	1	5	60	
8	Bainda Bazar	1	5	60	
9	Keoramal Nyabad	1	5	60	
10	Gaomesh	2	32 8 0	32 8 0	
	Total	60	...	3,600	

J. C. PRICE,
Offg. Settlement Officer.

No. 701A, dated Fort William, the 28th September 1878.

From—H. L. HARRISON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
Lower Provinces,

To—The Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Revenue Department.

I AM desired to submit the following preliminary report on the proceedings taken in connection with the re-settlement of the Jellamuta estate in the Midnapore district. In this report, as in the case of the Majnamuta estate, laid before Government with my letter No. 468A, dated 2nd July 1878, the Board will review all proceedings as far as the *tenants* of the estate are concerned, the question of land revenue to be assessed being left for determination after these proceedings have been confirmed or modified.

2. *Geographical position of Jellamuta.*—The temporarily-settled estate of Jellamuta consists of 10 pergunnahs, all situated in Hidgellee, and in general interlaced with the pergunnahs of Majnamuta. The main difference is that Jellamuta has no pergunnah situated like Doro Dumnán north or east of the Huldee river, and therefore no pergunnah whose situation *per se* secures higher prices and a conspicuously better market than the rest. There is no radical difference between the pergunnahs of Jellamuta, but the Calcutta market being the market for the surplus produce of the whole estate, the pergunnahs situated more to the north-east and nearer to the canal can secure somewhat better prices than those situated further off to the south-west. Erinch, through which the canal runs, and Baidna Bazar, three out of the four villages of which are mixed up with Erinch, are the most favourably situated, and next to them would be Jellamuta, situated north-west of that pergunnah, and Taraf Bisuan which is in detached blocks, the largest being in pergunnahs Majnamuta, Paharpore, and Erinch. Paharpore is higher up among the sources of the Rasulpore river, while the remaining five pergunnahs are all south-west of that river.

3. *History of the Estate.*—The estate came under the control of the Hon'ble East India Company's Government in the year 1765. It then comprised 13 pergunnahs, and Beernarayan Roy was the proprietor. He died in 1782 and was succeeded by his son Narnarayan Roy, who lived up to 1839, when he gave place to his eldest son, Rudranarayan Roy, who died the following year, leaving the property to his half-brothers, Krishna Indranarayan Roy and Kunwar-narayan Roy. These two were constantly engaged in litigation with each other, and ultimately obtained a decree dividing the estate between them in moieties, and it is now so held by the parties in possession, two ladies, *viz.*, Sreemutya Hari Prya Debi, the Kunwar's widow, and Sreemutya Ananda Moye Debi, widow of Gajendranarayan Roy, who succeeded his father, Krishna Indranarayan, in 1854.

4. It would be uninteresting, as indeed it is unnecessary, to follow closely all the vicissitudes to which the estate was subjected from one cause and another during the earlier period of its history. Suffice it to say that up to 1801 Jellamuta comprised 13 pergunnahs. In that year an attempt was made to settle the whole permanently; but the zemindar, Narnarayan Roy, accepted the offer only as regards *three* pergunnahs, *viz.*, Bahirimuta, Bhaitgurh, and Dacanmal. These

were accordingly detached from the parent estate, which has ever since consisted of ten pergunnahs only. From 1801 to 1845 the estate was sometimes farmed for a few years, sometimes held khas, and sometimes leased to the proprietor, according as the circumstances at the time rendered practicable. But in 1845 it was regularly settled with the proprietors for a term which was to expire in 1866. In 1851, however, the proprietors defaulted, and the estate was taken and retained under khas management for the remaining 15 years of the settlement, the collections being made through the medium of farmers, who received from 20 to 30 per cent. as collection expenses and profits. In 1867 the estate was settled with the proprietors temporarily for one year on substantially the same terms as the settlement of 1845, and this summary arrangement has been renewed at intervals until completion of the settlement now under review.

5. *Measurement.*—The system of measurement adopted by the Settlement Officer and his establishment was precisely the same as that in the Majnamuta estate,* *i.e.*, the villages were measured cadastrally except where there were waste lands in large blocks or compact tracts of lakhiraj or resumed lakhiraj permanently settled. These were measured mehalwar, as nothing was to be gained by mapping the internal divisions. The area was first computed in standard bighas of 14,400 square feet, and then reduced to local bighas to admit of the application of local rates. The local bigha in Jellamuta is even larger than that in Majnamuta, being 23,210 instead 19,845 square feet. An acre is therefore equal to 1*b.* 17*c.* 10*b.* 18*g.* of local measurement. None of the ryots, it is reported, raised any objections to the measurement proceedings in any of the pergunnahs in this estate.

6. The subjoined table shows the total area of the estate in *local bighas*, as ascertained at the present and at the former settlement, the assessed and unassessed areas being exhibited separately—

PERGUNNAHS.	PRESENT SETTLEMENT AREA IN LOCAL BIGHAS.			FORMER SETTLEMENT AREA IN LOCAL BIGHAS.			PERCENTAGE OF—		
	Assessed, includ- ing resumed rent- free.	Unassessed, in- cluding rent-free.	Total.	Assessed, includ- ing resumed rent- free.	Unassessed, in- cluding rent-free.	Total.	Increase of total area—col. 4 on col. 7.	Increase of assess- ed area—col. 2 on col. 6.	Decrease of unassess- ed area—col. 6 on col. 3.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Jellamuta ..	38,062	10,346	48,408	37,043	11,533	48,576			
2. Taraf Bisuan ..	26,801	8,582	35,443	24,583	10,175	34,758			
3. Erinch ..	44,141	13,659	57,799	39,539	17,545	57,084			
4. Paharpore ..	8,894	5,315	14,209	6,820	5,989	12,809			
5. Kalindi Balshai ..	12,842	5,463	18,305	11,070	6,080	17,150			
6. Bhogra ..	12,588	5,940	18,528	11,673	4,935	16,608			
7. Khalsa Bhogra ..	3,775	1,059	4,834	3,305	1,301	4,606			
8. Banda Bazar ..	1,101	200	1,307	876	422	1,298			
9. Gaomesh ..	1,418	241	1,659	1,307	258	1,655			
10. Nyabad Keoramal ..	1,248	454	1,702	1,168	411	1,579			
Total ..	150,930	51,264	202,194	137,474	58,649	196,123	3'1	9'2	12'4

vide paragraph 11 of Board's report on Majnamuta, No. 498A, dated the 2nd July 1878.

7. The total area of the estate is shown to have increased by 6,071 bighas. The largest increase is in Bhograi, where the range of sand-hills running through the pergunnah was not measured in detail, but estimated for at the previous settlement. Accurate measurements have shown that the estimate was far below the correct area. The next largest increase is in Kalindi Balshai, a littoral pergunnah, where the area has increased by alluvion, and in Paharpore, a jungle pergunnah, which was measured in a very incomplete manner in the last settlement. The increase in these three pergunnahs alone amounts to 4,475 bighas out of the 6,071 bighas, leaving 1,596 bighas scattered over the rest of the estate, where the result is rather due to the more accurate measurement of the present day than to any other cause. But it is satisfactory to notice that, while the unassessed area has decreased by 7,385 bighas, the assessed area has increased by 13,456 bighas. This is of course due to the reclamation of land due to improved embankments and other causes.

8. As in Majnamuta, the discrepancies between these measurements and the professional survey, which remain unaccounted for, are small, as shown in the table given below :—

PERGUNNAHS.	Area by survey.	Area by settlement measure- ment.	AGGREGATE DIFFER- ENCE.		Percentage of discre- pancy.
			Increase.	Decrease.	
1	2	3	4	5	6
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	
1. Jellamuta	32,825	32,627	198	'6
2. Taraf Bisuan	25,182	25,704	5'22	...	2'0
3. Erinch	44,453	43,736	717	1'6
4. Paharpore	No comparison can be made, as the figures of the professional survey had not been sent up to the date of the settlement report.				
5. Kalindi Balshai	20,930	20,407	523	2'5
6. Bhograi	10,442	10,389	53	'5
7. Khalsa Bhograi	2,594	2,586	68	2'6
8. Baidna Bazar	The difference is less than an acre.				
9. Gaomesh	918	879	39	4'2
10. Nyabad Keoramal	2,685	2,642	43	1'6

Thus it is found in this and Majnamuta that the area measured falls somewhat short of that measured by the survey.

9. *Classification of land.*—The lands have been classified, as in Majnamuta, under two main heads, *viz.*, *kala* and *jal*. The Commissioner writes—

“The first includes *dhasa*, of which there are several classes in different pergunnahs. In the former settlement there were eight subdivisions of *dhasa*, as in Baidna Bazar, but in the present settlement no more than five classes of *dhasa* land are recognized. In some of the pergunnahs there is a separate class of land included under head *kala*, which is called *balu* or *balu dhasa*, and which again is sub-divided into 1st, 2nd, or 3rd classes. The *jal* or rice lands are sub-divided into classes according to their qualities. In the former settlement this land was sub-divided in some cases into five classes; but the present settlement does not in any instance recognize more than four

sub-divisions. The jal lands in pergunnah Jellamuta itself are very fertile, but the defective drainage of the pergunnah, which is low-lying, prevents their being as rich as this kind of land is in other parts of the estate."

10. *Embankments.*—The state of the embankments in Hidgellee has been fully described in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the report on Majnamuta, and this description applies equally to the Jellamuta estate. The pergunnah of Kalindi Balshai is the only one which is situated directly on the coast, and it is protected against a cyclone wave by the great sea-dyke. Bhograi and Khalsa Bhograi are situated further inland, and would be protected also by the sand ridges which intersect them. Pergunnahs Jellamuta, Erinch, Baina Bazar, and most of Taraf Bisuan are situated north-east of the Rasulpore, and therefore are not protected against a cyclone-wave, but they are so far inland that they would not as a rule suffer much from an inundation of salt-water; but Jellamuta is much exposed to the risk of inundation by the fresh water floods of the Kalliaghie, and in the cyclone of 1874 it lost the greater part of its crop owing to this cause.

11. The condition of the interior embankments or grambheries has been already fully described in a separate report, and Government has accepted the proposals of the Board to make an allowance to the zemindars to keep these embankments in order. This allowance should also embrace the jol-nikasi or drainage khals which have been neglected everywhere in this estate, especially in Jellamuta pergunnah itself, which has suffered much owing to this cause. Mr. Price, it will be remembered, made a proposition to improve these khals at the expense of Government, but it was negatived in Government order No. 1678 of the 16th June 1877.

12. *Rates.*—In the Majnamuta estate the Settlement Officer reported that he and his subordinates experienced difficulty in fixing the rates to be demanded owing to the absence of any permanently-settled estates in the immediate neighbourhood by comparison with which the rates could be determined. Hence the rates were fixed for the most part at a very lenient computation, and the enhancement justified by the test of the amount of the yield, of its value, and of the surplus left to the ryot after deducting costs of cultivation and other expenses.

13. The Board were not satisfied with the fairness of the years selected, but regarded as a safer test the comparison of the average prices of produce now and at the former settlement. As this test indicated that the proposed rates were well within the maximum that might have been demanded, they recommended their confirmation and the Government have recently confirmed them.

14. In the Jellamuta estate, in almost all the pergunnahs comprising it, the rates are reported to have been selected after comparison with those prevailing in neighbouring pergunnahs or estates; though, as before, with the view of testing the fairness of the proposed rates, calculations based on the outturn of produce and value thereof have also been made. In one pergunnah alone, Keormal Nyabad, was the rate assessed solely on the Majnamuta system. Regarding this pergunnah the Settlement Officer writes—

"The rates assessed in Keoramal Nyabad bear the same ratio to the increased productiveness of soil and enhanced value of produce as he old rates bore to the former value of produce. Nay, I should rather

say that the ryot of the present day, with the enhanced value of the produce of his holding, is better off by our assessment than the ryot of 1845 was with the estimated value of the produce of that year and the corresponding assessment." "The increased value of produce," observes the Commissioner, "is, of course, the safest ground for enhancement, as the difference in the value of produce can be established by the returns for the several years during which such statistical information has been regularly and periodically furnished, and these can be still further confirmed by proof of the prevailing rates in the Calcutta market, on which they must be, to a large extent, dependent. The increase of productiveness of soil can of course never be founded on such satisfactory data."

15. Annexed is a statement, marked A, showing the rates assessed in the different pergunnahs of Jellamuta in juxtaposition with those prevailing in the neighbouring pergunnahs. But in considering these rates the Settlement Officer says—

"It should be borne in mind that the bigha in Jellamuta is larger than the bigha in the permanently-settled pergunnahs adjacent. The rates of the permanently-settled pergunnahs given in the statement are, however, adjusted to the Jellamuta standard. They are, as a rule, much in excess of the rates proposed for the assessment of Jellamuta. The legitimate conclusion to be arrived at therefore, if the productive powers of the soil are equal in both the temporarily-settled and permanently-settled pergunnahs, is that the proposed assessment is fair and equitable, and yet none of the ryots have signed the jumma bundee, save those of two villages of 37 in pergunnah Erinch, though many showed an inclination at first to accept our assessment till they were led away by the persuasions of some of the leading ryots, who cultivate large areas in their holdings and on whom the new assessment would press with particular weight."

16. The table below shows separately by pergunnahs the comparative results obtained by the Settlement Officer in comparing the present with the former settlement on an average bigha of rice land. Of course it depends entirely for its value on the fairness of the average produce taken as the basis of calculation—

I.—Pergunnah Jellamuta, 48,408 bighas.

	Average produce in paddy.	Value of produce including straw.	DEDUCT			Profit of the ryot.
			Cost of cultivation.	Average rent.	Total.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Mds. S. C.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Previous settlement ...	12 0 0	4 12 0	1 0 0	1 3 6	2 3 6	2 8 6
Present ditto ..	12 0 0	9 12 0	3 8 0	1 15 0	5 7 0	4 5 0
* Percentage of gross value taken as rent ...						
Ditto of net profit as rent ..						
						19'7 31

* The Board do not know why the figures 12 are given here and 11 opposite Erinch. The correct figures are given in paragraphs 35 and 38.

II.—Pergunnah Taraf Bisuan, 35,443 bighas.

1	Average produce in paddy.	Value of produce including straw.	DEDUCT			Profit of the ryot.	8
			Cost of cultivation.	Average rent.	Total.		
2	3	4	5	6	7		
	Mds. S. C.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Previous settlement	9 2 4	3 12 0	1 7 0	1 3 0	2 10 0	1 2 0	
Present ditto	10 6 10	7 13 4	2 8 0	1 12 9	4 4 9	3 8 7	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						22.9
	Ditto of net profit as rent						33.7

III.—Pergunnah Erinch, 57,799 bighas.

Previous settlement	8 0 0	4 8 0	1 7 6	1 2 9	2 10 3	1 14 9	
Present ditto	11 0 0	8 12 0	2 8 0	1 11 6	4 3 6	4 8 6	
	* Percentage of gross value taken as rent						19.6
	Ditto of net profit as rent						27.5

IV.—Pergunnah Paharpore, 14,209 bighas.

Previous settlement	7 14 0	3 8 0	1 0 0	1 3 3	2 3 3	1 4 0	
Present ditto	10 4 13	8 5 3	2 8 0	1 9 0	4 1 3	4 4 0	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						19
	Ditto of net profit as rent						27.08

V.—Pergunnah Kalindi Balshai, 1305 bighas.

Previous settlement	No figures procurable		...	1 4 3	
Present ditto	9 0 0	7 0 0	2 8 0	1 12 6	4 4 6	2 11 6	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						25.5
	Ditto of net profit as rent						39.6

VI.—Pergunnah Bhograi, 18,528 bighas.

Previous settlement	No figures procurable		...	1 6 0	
Present ditto	10 0 0	8 0 0	2 8 0	1 12 9	4 4 9	3 11 3	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						22.4
	Ditto of net profit as rent						32.6

VII.—Pergunnah Khalsa Bhograi, 4,834 bighas.

Previous settlement	No figures procurable		...	1 0 6	
Present ditto	10 0 0	8 0 0	2 8 0	1 11 0	4 3 0	3 13 0	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						21.09
	Ditto of net profit as rent						30.7

VIII.—Pergunnah Rainda Bazar, 1,307 bighas.

Previous settlement	7 0 0	4 0 0	1 4 0	1 9 9	2 13 9	1 2 3	
Present ditto	9 0 0	7 4 0	2 13 0	1 15 9	4 12 9	2 7 3	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						27.4
	Ditto of net profit as rent						44.7

IX.—Pergunnah Gaomesh, 1,659 bighas.

Previous settlement	No figures procurable		...	1 10 3	
Present ditto	9 34 0	7 10 0	2 8 0	1 15 9	4 1 3	3 8 9	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						20.7
	Ditto of net profit as rent						30.8

X.—Pergunnah Nyabad Keoramal, 1,702 bighas.

Previous settlement	11 8 0	4 7 6	1 8 0	0 14 9	2 6 9	2 0 9	
Present ditto	9 34 0	7 10 0	2 8 0	1 9 3	4 1 3	3 8 9	
	Percentage of gross value taken as rent						20.7
	Ditto of net profit as rent						30.8

* See note to Jellamuta.

17. It will be observed that there is a great disparity in what Mr. Price terms the amount of profit left to the ryots in the different pergunnahs. The Settlement Officer has expressed his inability to explain this to his own satisfaction. He, however, says—

“The same disparity is noticed as having existed at the time of the last settlement. Whereas* Rs. 2-8 was the profit left to a ryot in Jellamuta in 1845, the ryot of Bisuan was obliged to rest content with Rs. 1-1-1 only, the disparity amounting to so much as Rs. 1-6-1, considerably more than the profit itself of the Bisuan ryot. In this re-settlement the disparity between the profit left to the ryot of Jellamuta and that of Baidna Bazar amounts to Rs. 1-12-6, but the value of the produce per bigha in the latter pergunnah is only Rs. 7-4, whereas it is Rs. 9-12 in Jellamuta, and the disparity in the proposed rates is almost nil—only 6 pies,—hence the Jellamuta ryot gets all the benefit of the greater productiveness of the soil of his pergunnah. In the former settlement the rate for the Baidna Bazar ryot was Rs. 1-9. whereas it was only Rs. 1-4 for the Jellamuta ryot; the enhancement by the proposed rate for the former is only 7 annas 6 pies, whereas it is so much as 12 annas arrears for the latter; yet the latter has much the larger profit. There can be no doubt that in the assessment of rates any disparity in the productiveness of the soil of different pergunnahs, however slight, operates greatly to the disadvantage of the ryot of the less productive pergunnah. But this is a natural consequence—at least so I take it. Of two pergunnahs, one very productive and the other only moderately so, an assessment of rates, however equitable, must be relatively much more lenient or less of a burden on the ryot of the more fertile pergunnah than on the ryot of the less fertile pergunnah.”

The correctness of this theory is perhaps open to question.

18. Up to this point the Board have been giving an outline of the views of the Commissioner and Settlement Officer, of the statistics by which the latter claims to justify his assessments, and of the arguments by which he explains any such inconsistencies as the statistics exhibit. As in the case of Majnamuta the Board doubt the accuracy of many of these statistics, and the soundness of the arguments. The years during which Mr. Price tested the produce were favourable and not average years, and the inconsistencies which he endeavours to explain would be far more simply explained by assuming that the average produce of Jellamuta as compared with other pergunnahs has been overstated. Mr. Price now takes 12 maunds as the average outturn per bigha in Jellamuta, but this is based on his measurements of 1875-76 alone; he puts aside altogether the measurements of 1876-77; in the former year he found an average of 12 maunds per bigha; the results of the experiments in 1876-77 are described in his report of the 9th February 1877, which formed an enclosure to Board's No. 217A of the 21st March 1877, from which it will be seen that he obtained 8 maunds 32 seers as the average result of experiments in 29 villages. On the other hand,

he calculates Rs. 3-8 as the cost of cultivation per bigha in Jellamuta and Rs. 2-8 in all the other pergunnahs of the estate, except Binda Bazar, where he states it at Rs. 2-13. There is no reason whatever why cultivation should cost more in Jellamuta than in the contiguous pergunnahs of Erinch and Taraf Bisuan, and the Board submit that the following figures, based on the experiments of the second year, would possibly be much nearer the mark for this pergunnah:—

			Mds. s.	Rs. a.
Average produce	8	32
			Rs. a.	
Value, including straw	7	3
			—	7 3
Cost of cultivation, including wages of ryot as an agricultural labourer	2	8
Proposed average rent	1	15
			—	4 7
Balance, being that which represents ryots' proprietary or occupancy interest in the land	2 12
			—	
Percentage of gross value taken as rent	27
Percentage of rent profit taken as rents	40

19. The Board would not therefore attach much weight to the statistics given in the above table. While conceding to them some value as a collateral test, they would rather lean upon the test adopted in the case of Majnamuta of the rise in the money value of produce combined with what they also consider the very good test of the rates actually ruling in similarly situated pergunnahs, if the similarity has been determined by competent judges.

20. The Board would not acknowledge that all the pergunnahs named by Mr. Price in table A are being fairly open to comparison with Jellamuta. Mynachur, Tumlook, and Sabang are on the opposite bank of the Kalliaghye, and the latter is not protected by embankments where it marches with Jellamuta. Gumgurrh and Auranganuggur are nearer the sea and differ in some respects, but Sujamuta and Bhuiyamuta are in every respect similar, and similarly situated. Portions of these are interlaced with Jellamuta, and the soil is in every respect similar. Sujamuta is now the property of the Maharane of Burdwan, who keeps up the bheries and drainage khals in a very effective state; in fact she has been reported to be the best zemindar in that part of the country; hence, though naturally similar, the ryots actually enjoy advantages which those of Jellamuta do not, but Bhuiyamuta is parallel in every respect. It belongs to many co-proprietors, of whom some of the Majnamuta proprietors are the largest shareholders, and the interior embankments and drainage channels have been totally neglected for many years past. Hence the Board would attach great weight to the fact that under all heads

bastu, kala or dhasa, and jal, the rates proposed for Jellamuta are lower than those prevailing under similar circumstances in Bhuiyamura.

21. It might be contested whether any of the pergunnahs shown in juxtaposition with Paharpore, Erinch, Bisuan, or Baina Bazar are precisely similar to that pergunnah, and admittedly there is no permanently-settled pergunnah similar to Nyabad Keoramal, but Orissa Balshai is fairly similar to Kalindi Balshai, and Mirgoda legitimately parallel to Bhograi and Khalsa Bhograi. As in all these cases Mr. Price's rates run well below the rates prevailing in the adjacent permanently-settled pergunnahs; the Board are thus far led to conclude that they are not more than might be legitimately recorded as demandable within these and, by inference, within the other pergunnahs of Jellamuta.

22. The next test, however, that of the rise of the value of produce, is not equally satisfactory. For the reasons given at length in paragraph 26 of the Majnamuta report, the Board would fix the following as the prevailing average prices in the several pergunnahs of Midnapore:—

(a) For Erinch, 12 annas per maund.

(b) For Jellamuta, Taraf Bisuan* and Baina Bazar,* 11 annas 6 pies.

(c) For Paharpore and Nyabad Keoramal, 11 annas.

(d) For Kalindi Balshai, Gaomesh, Bhograi, and Khalsa Bhograi, 10 annas 6 pies.

The difference in price is mainly dependent on proximity to the Calcutta market, and on the quality of the water carriage.

23. The table given below shows the percentage of the rise in prices in each pergunnah since the last settlement in 1845, and the percentage by which the average rates now assessed by the Settlement Officer on rice land exceed the average of the last settlement—

I.—Pergunnah Jellamuta.

	Area of jal land.	Total assessment on jal land.	Average rate of rent per bigha.	Average price of paddy per maund.	REMARKS.
		Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Previous settlement	24,049	29,200	1 3 6	0 5 4	The average price at the former settlement is too low.
Present ditto	25,198	48,964	1 15 0	0 11 6	
Percentage of increase	58.9	115	

II.—Pergunnah Taraf Bisuan.

Previous settlement	16,584	19,709	1 3 0	0 5 0	Same remark as in Jellamuta.
Present ditto	19,060	34,378	1 12 2	0 11 6	
Percentage of increase	51.3	125	

III.—Pergunnah Erinch.

Previous settlement	29,205	34,517	1 2 9	0 8 0	This rate is too high.
Present ditto	31,522	54,088	1 11 6	0 12 0	
Percentage of increase	46.7	50	

* These two pergunnahs being scattered among other pergunnahs the rates selected are such as should be the average of the scattered fragments.

IV.—Pergunnah Paharpore.

	Area of jal land.	Total assessment on jal land	Average rate of rent per bigha.	Average price of paddy per maund.	REMARKS.
		Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Previous settlement	4,140	4,967	1 3 3	0 6 6	
Present ditto ...	5,206	8,269	1 9 3	0 11 0	
Percentage of increase	31'3	69	

V.—Pergunnah Kalindi Balshai.

Previous settlement	5,362	6,835	1 4 3	Not given.
Present ditto ...	6,847	12,288	1 12 6	0 10 6
Percentage of increase	40'7	

VI.—Pergunnah Bhograi.

Previous settlement	4,457	6,189	1 6 0	0 8 0*	Much too high.
Present ditto ...	5,270	9,467	1 12 9	0 10 6	
Percentage of increase	30'6	31	

VII.—Pergunnah Khalsa Bhograi.

Previous settlement	1,942	2,012	1 0 6	Not as-
Present ditto ..	2,139	3,636	1 11 0	certainable.
Percentage of increase	63'6	0 10 6

VIII.—Pergunnah Baidia Bazar.

Previous settlement	615	990	1 9 9	0 8 0	Rate too high.
Present ditto ...	778	1,538	1 15 9	0 11 6	
Percentage of increase	23'3	43	

IX.—Pergunnah Gaomesh.

Previous settlement	838	1,375	1 10 3	Not given.
Present ditto ...	851	1,690	1 15 9	0 10 6
Percentage of increase	20'9	

X.—Pergunnah Nyabad Keoramal.

Previous settlement	702	646	0 14 9	0 6 0
Present ditto ...	762	1,206	1 9 3	0 11 0
Percentage of increase	71'1	83

24. It will be seen that, as in the case of Majnamuta, the increase in the rise of the value of produce is in all cases in which the former rate is mentioned found to be in excess of the average increase in the rates of rent, but the divergencies are most marked, the increase being as little as 31 per cent. in some cases, and as high as 125 in others. But the true explanation of this undoubtedly is that the former rates are manifestly very inaccurate. If the price of paddy in Jellamuta was 5 annas 4 pies per maund, and 5 annas per maund in Bisuan, it is quite impossible that the average price of the same kind of paddy sown can have been 8 annas per maund in Erinch. It is as absurd as it would be to state the average price of common salt to be

* Subsequently reported by Mr. Price to be a mistake. Should be 5 annas, not 8 annas. The moonsiff also found 5 annas.—H. L. D.

8 seers per rupee at Hooghly and 9 seers at Howrah, but 13 seers per rupee at Serampore. The Board therefore, as some check upon these erroneous estimates, propose to take the aggregate of all the prices given at the former settlement and strike an average so as to correct the higher estimates in one pergunnah by the lower estimates in another. It will be seen that in the Majnamuta report, omitting the exceptional pergunnah of Doro Dumnah, the average prices stated were—

					As. P.
Majnamuta	7 0
Kusba Hidgellee	5 4
Balijora	7 0
Datta Khoroi	7 0
Nyabad Majna	6 0
Sarifabad	7 0
Amirabad	6 6
Shipore	7 0
					<hr/>
					8 ÷ 52 10
					<hr/>
Average					6 7
					<hr/>

while in the Jellamuta report the figures given are—

					As. P.
Jellamuta	5 4
Taraf Bisuan	5 0
Erinch	8 0
Paharpore	6 6
Bhograi	8 0
Bainda Bazar	8 0
Nyabad Keoramal	6 0
					<hr/>
					7 ÷ 46 10
					<hr/>
Average					6 8
					<hr/>

25. It seems to the Board that the correspondence between these averages is a fair guarantee for their reliability. The prices were evidently stated with more accuracy in the Majnamuta settlement of 1845, as they fluctuate so much less, especially if Kusba Hidgellee is omitted; and looking to all the figures in the Majnamuta pergunnahs, and to the average of those in Jellamuta, the conclusion seems fair that something between 6 and 7 annas may safely be taken as the

average ruling price in the Jellamuta and Majnamuta estates (omitting Doro Dumnun) at the time of the last settlement.

26. Taking the average of the prices adopted by the Board for the very same pergunnahs as give the average of 6 annas 8 pies, it will be found that it comes to 11 annas 3 pies, and this would give an average increase in the value of produce of 68 per cent. In other words, the Board are satisfied, from a consideration of all the evidence before them, which, when analysed, seems to converge very satisfactorily to this conclusion, that paddy, the staple produce of the country, has risen in price not less than 60 per cent. since the date of the last settlement. This average, which applies as well to Majnamuta as to Jellamuta, was enough in the former estate to cover the increase, and leave a large margin in all pergunnahs, except Kusba Hidgellee and Nyabad Majna, both of which had been very lightly assessed at the former settlement, while the latter, a nyabad pergunnah, had been lightly assessed under special circumstances which are now forming the subject of a separate report. Next to these pergunnahs the largest increase was 23·5 per cent., or scarcely more than one-third of the augmentation of prices. Thus the Board were able to conclude without hesitation that, taking the settlement as a whole, it would be possible to justify a larger increase, but that the increase proposed was clearly defensible. As regards Jellamuta the Board are constrained to confess that the rates proposed approach much nearer the limit of what can equitably be demanded than in Majnamuta, especially in the larger pergunnahs of Jellamuta, Taraf Bisuan, and Erinch, and as Mr. Price's attention was drawn to this, his remarks in reply ought to be reproduced for the consideration of Government—

"My attention," he writes on the 20th July 1878—"as I compare the statement prepared in the Board's office for estate Jellamuta with that for estate Majnamuta, is first drawn to the difference of ratios in the two statements between percentage of increase in rates and percentage of increase in price. Whereas in every pergunnah in Majnamuta the rise in rates is less than the increase in value of

* Jellamuta and Baidia Bazar.

† Erinch, Bhograi, and Nyabad Keoramal.

‡ In the statement first sent to Mr. Price by the Board lower rates were proposed for these three and some other pergunnahs than those now given. Mr. Price in this letter raised certain objections to these rates, the force of which the Board have admitted and have modified their average prices accordingly. Thus this passage of Mr. Price's letter is no longer applicable.

produce, in only two pergunnahs* of Jellamuta is this the case; in three† the rise in rates is actually greater‡ than the increase in value, there being no sufficient information with regard to the remaining five pergunnahs. The first impression therefore that the mind receives is that estate Jellamuta has been more rigorously assessed than estate Majnamuta, and this impression, though to a certain extent true, is not quite justified by facts and circumstances. Where the enhancement in rates is based on the application of the standard prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs, it is my opinion, I admit, that it will always be more assured, and

in consequence as a rule greater than where assessment proceedings are regulated by increased productive power and increase in value of produce. The enquiries made in the latter direction, to have any real

and tangible results, must always be made with extreme caution; even when every precaution has been taken to secure correct conclusions, the mind is never satisfied that the same reasons that have weight with the assessing officer will exercise their proper influence on the supervising authorities. The cause of this want of certainty in assessing rates according to productiveness and value is not far to seek. The rates current in neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs can be ascertained without the slightest doubt of their actual prevalence; evidence that would be unimpeachable in any court of justice can always be procured on the point. It does not require any remarkable astuteness in an assessing officer to compare and judge correctly of the relative qualities of the lands of two adjacent pergunnahs—one permanently, the other temporarily-settled—whereas the market value of produce is always fluctuating. The inherent productiveness of a field, irrespective of any comparison with other fields, can never be gauged with the degree of precision that would satisfy every person; in fact, the assessment of rates according to productiveness and value of produce depends on the personal opinion of the assessing officer, formed after a consideration of as many premises as he can bring together, which opinion, after all, in the estimation of others, may not seem to be quite warranted by the circumstances. The assessment of rates according to known and recognized standards is a much simpler and less uncertain operation, and hence it is that the former mode of assessment will nearly always be found to result in a more indulgent treatment of the ryots than the latter, where the full equitable demand will in most cases be rigorously enforced.

“Having made these preliminary observations, I proceed to show, however, that the comparative statement prepared in the Board's office does not after all enable us to form an opinion which may be considered as correct beyond cavil, regarding the assessment of rates in the Jellamuta estate. With regard to pergunnah Jellamuta itself, I have but little to say; the percentage of increase in rates compared with the increase in market value of produce is by no means excessive. It should be remembered that Jellamuta had in 1845 as good water or land carriage for its produce as it has in 1878. On the other hand Erinch, which is about eight or nine miles distant from the borders of Jellamuta, was in this respect much worse off in 1845 than it is now, for the Tidal canal had not been excavated, and therefore I do not understand why the average price of paddy per maund in Erinch in 1845 was said to be 8 annas, whereas it was only 5 annas 4 pies in Jellamuta, the two prices being in the ratio of one and a half to one. I should have thought that the price of paddy in 1845 in

* The Board entirely concur in these remarks.

Erinch was rather less than that in Jellamuta, instead of greater.* I consider that the price in Erinch in 1845, as revealed by the old records, altogether untrustworthy, and that no real comparison can be made between percentage of increase in rates and percentage of increase in price of paddy. If 5 annas 4 pies be taken as the price of paddy in Erinch in 1845, as undoubtedly it ought to be, if the figures for Jellamuta are correct, the present

price would be more than double the former price, and the assessment of Erinch instead of appearing very heavy, would be seen to be a very light one,—lighter than that of Jellamuta.* In addition to what I have said above, I think that the present market price of paddy in Hidgellee, on an average Rs. 2 per maund, should be made a factor in gauging the validity of the proposed assessments. In pergunnah Bhograi the statement shows the old price of paddy to be 8 annas; this could hardly have been the case. The pergunnah is in a retired and unfrequented position, with no sufficient water or land carriage; the old papers, besides, do not disclose the price of paddy in 1845; the price recorded in the statement must have crept in through a mistake; it is much more likely to have been 5 annas 4 pies than 8 annas. No valid conclusion can be arrived at with regard to this pergunnah in the absence of all former statistics. Bainda Bazar has but four villages interspersed among the villages of Erinch. The remarks that I have made with regard to the latter pergunnah apply with equal force in the case of the former pergunnah."

* * * * *

"Lastly, with regard to Keoramal Nyabad, I beg to explain that it is situated alongside of pergunnah Majna Nyabad; its circumstances are precisely similar to those of the latter pergunnah. Why has the present price of paddy been assumed to be 10 annas in Keoramal Nyabad and 11 annas in Majna Nyabad?

Note.—Extract from Mr. Mills' report, paragraph 105—

"* * * No exception can be taken to the rates on the score of highness; they are perhaps rather too favourable, being below those of Nyabad Majna, which is almost on a parity with this mahal as regards situation and capability. I see no reason, however, to interfere, and the assessment is approved.

† This criticism is quite correct, and the Board have altered the estimated average price in Nyabad Keoramal accordingly.

is so remarkable as to engender a strong belief in the general fitness of their proceedings.

"My object in making the foregoing observations is merely to show that it would not be an accurate conclusion to come to, as one would necessarily do from a bare consideration of the statement, that in three pergunnahs at least of the Jellamuta estate the increase in rates is in advance of the increase in market value of produce, and that therefore the assessment of the Jellamuta estate is not a light but heavy assessment. I hope to be able to show later on that, whatever may be the increase in the rates that we have proposed, that increase is amply justified by the standard prevailing in the neighbouring permanently-settled pergunnahs where that standard has been taken as the basis of the proposed assessment, as it has been in 8 of the 10 pergunnahs of the estate; and that I cannot consistently recommend

any departure now from the proposals I have already made in my several pergunnahwaree reports.

"In the statement prepared in the Board's office the figures given in connection with pergunnahs Baina Bazar and Gaomesh would also lead the casual observer to believe that the assessments in the Jellamuta estate press more heavily on the ryots than those of the Majnamuta estate—in short, that they press more heavily than they actually do. The proposed average rate of rent per bigha in Baina Bazar and Gaomesh is Rs. 1-15-9, but both pergunnahs taken together cover a very small tract of country; in all they contain five villages only, the former pergunnah four and the latter one. No inference that would apply generally can be drawn from the statistics of these two pergunnahs, and therefore, if the assessment made in them is put out of view altogether, it will be seen that the rates proposed in the remaining pergunnahs of Jellamuta are not really in excess of those proposed for Majnamuta.*

* This the Board cannot admit to be correct.

be put Doro Dumnán,

† The Board are certainly of opinion that if Rs. 1-15-6 is a fair average rent for Doro Dumnán, Rs. 1-15 is too high for Jellamuta; but Mr. Price has not done justice to his argument, for the Rs. 1-15-6 is for a smaller bigha than the Rs. 1-15.

Against Jellamuta—a very prosperous pergunnah—should be put Doro Dumnán, with circumstances very similar, where the rates are Rs 1-15 and Rs. 1-15-6 respectively.† The proposed rates in the remaining pergunnahs of Majnamuta and Jellamuta range side by side from Rs. 1-9-3 to Rs. 1-13. I take no note of Kismut Pataspore and Naruamuta, where rates of Rs. 1-5-6 and Rs. 1-5 are assessed. These are pergunnahs, the one very unprosperous from the very commencement, the other with a

large portion of its area but lately reclaimed or being reclaimed from jungle. As regards old average rates the Majnamuta estate was less lightly assessed than Jellamuta in 1845. Here, again, Gaomesh and Baina Bazar must be kept out of consideration altogether, as being pergunnahs with too insignificant an area. The highest old average rate was Rs. 1-9-6 in Doro Dumnán; it was Rs. 1-9 in Kismut Shipore, Rs. 1-8 in Amirabad, and so on; the highest old average rate in the Jellamuta estates, leaving out Gaomesh and Baina Bazar, was Rs. 1-6 in Bhograi, Rs. 1-4-3 in Kalindi Balshai, only Rs. 1-3-6, and Rs. 1-2-9 in Jellamuta and Erinch, which have always been considered very fine pergunnahs. Keoramal Nyabad was lightly assessed in 1845, with an average rate of Rs. 0-14-9, under circumstances precisely similar to those of Majna Nyabad."

27. The Board are satisfied (indeed, Mr. Price in some of his remarks admits as much) that Jellamuta has been on the whole more highly assessed at the present settlement than Majnamuta. As he objects to the small pergunnahs being included as their case is often exceptional, the comparison may be limited to the large pergunnahs of each estate, but the conclusion is none the less clear.

28. Six pergunnahs in Majnamuta contain more than bighas 10,000—Majnamuta, Doro Dumnán, Kusba Hidgellee, Balijora, Naruamuta, and Kismut Pataspore. No records of the rates in the

last settlement are available for Naruamuta. In the other five pergunnahs the average rate of increase is—

Majnamuta	17·3	} per cent.
Doro Dumnun	..	.	23·5	
Kusba Hidgellee	56·7	
Balijora	22·7	
Kismut Patasporo	19·4	
			5 ÷ 139·6	
Average	...		27·9	

Whereas in Jellamuta the increase in the six pergunnahs above the same limit is—

Jellamuta	58·9	} per cent.
Taraf Bisuan	51·3	
Erinch	46·7	
Paharpore	31·3	
Kalindi Balshai	40·7	
Bhograi	30·6	
<hr/>				
6 ÷ 259·5				
<hr/>				
43·2				

29. The same general results also may be brought out in another way. In Majnamuta, at the last settlement, 177,357 bighas were assessed, and the rent assessed upon them was Rs. 1,84,124, or Rs. 1-0-7 per local bigha. At the present settlement the area assessed has increased to 197,650 bighas, and Mr. Price's proposed assessment is Rs. 2,59,770, or Rs. 1-5 per local bigha. In Jellamuta the area assessed was 137,474 bighas, but the Jellamuta bigha is about 17 per cent. larger than the Majnamuta bigha, hence these would be equal to about 160,500 Majnamuta bighas, and the rent assessed was Rs. 1,51,767, or 15 annas 2 pies per bigha of the same size. In the present settlement the area assessed has increased to 150,930 Jellamuta bighas, or say 175,500 Majnamuta bighas, and the rent proposed is Rs. 2,44,791, or Rs. 1-6-3 per bigha. This shows that Majnamuta was the more heavily assessed at the former settlement while the present settlement relatively overweighs Jellamuta.

30. The word relatively is used designedly, for the Board must record their deliberate opinion that even in the Jellamuta estate the increase is not above what might be legitimately demanded. It is below the average increase in the value of produce, and the Board have taken as their average not a mere arithmetical mean, but a rate which they believe will be a fair average for all seasons in which there is no exceptional demand—that is, all seasons in which prices only fluctuate owing to the outturn being better or worse, and not owing to a famine *elsewhere*; such seasons will be seasons of excess profit over and above the increase of 60 per cent., which the Board consider to be the

minimum in the average increase in the value of produce since 1845. It seems to the Board that it is a wise and lenient, if not an obligatory, policy not to drive the ryots to rely on a certain proportion of exceptional years in order to make two ends meet. He ought to be placed in a position in which he can get along without depending on such windfalls, and if they come, they should be to him an opportunity of clearing himself from his liabilities and making a fresh start. Selecting their average on this principle, the Board must admit that, if Government resolve on sanctioning the rates proposed for Jellamuta, their action would be quite defensible in every pergunnah of the estate.

31. The Board, however, would submit that when two estates, such as Jellamuta and Majnamuta are being settled together, and when they are so similarly circumstanced, an endeavour should be made to treat them with equal leniency, and they will not feel that they have been treated justly unless this treatment is relatively as well as absolutely equitable. On the other hand, the settlement has been made with great care, and the conclusions arrived at after much labour and expense, and the Board are most reluctant to interfere with it, unless it presents any grave blots.

32. In this spirit it is proposed to take up the pergunnahs one by one and examine their rates. In Paharpore, Bhograi, Baina Bazar, and Gaomesh, the increase is moderate, ranging from 20·9 to 31·3—not above the average of the Majnamuta estate; and these rates may, it seems, be safely approved. In Kalindi Balshai much more effective protection than formerly has been afforded by the construction of the great sea-dyke only completed in 1875; the increase may therefore be very legitimately insisted on.

33. As regards pergunnah Khalsa Bhograi the increase in rates seems very large—63·6; but the Board have carefully examined the Settlement Officer's grounds, and are satisfied that they are sufficient. The real fact is that the pergunnah was settled with great leniency at the former settlement, and not that it is being at all harshly rated now. It is interspersed with pergunnah Bhograi, and is essentially land of the same class. It will be seen that its average rate is still less than that of Bhograi, but the experiments made in testing the crops in both pergunnahs in the years 1875-76 and 1876-77 yielded the same results for each, *viz.*, slightly above 10 maunds. The assessments in all these pergunnahs, Bhograi, Khalsa Bhograi, Gaomesh, and Kalindi Balshai, were all made by the same officer, and there is no reason to suppose that he bore more harshly on one pergunnah than another. In short, it seems clear that, whether owing to its being originally khalsa, as the name implies, or to any other cause, its rent has been abnormally lenient; that the distinction, whatever it may have been, no longer exists; all that has been done is to remove an anomaly, and not to create one. The Board would therefore confirm the rates in Khalsa Bhograi.

34. In Nyabad Keoramal, also, the increase is very large—71 per cent.; but this pergunnah is mixed up with, and closely similar to, pergunnah Nyabad Majna, in the Majnamuta estate. In that

pergunnah the average rates were 15 annas per bigha and the new proposed rates Rs. 1-9-6. In Nyabad Keoramal the average rates were 14 annas and 9 pies per bigha and are Rs. 1-9-3; the increase in one case was 70, in the other 71 per cent. Mr. Price has pointed out that the assessments were made by different officers, and the results are almost identical, though he has apparently overlooked the different sizes of the bighas. The Government have, in passing orders on the Majnamuta report, called attention to the great increase in Nyabad Majna, and the Board, in reply, are submitting a report explaining the increase. If that report is considered satisfactory, it will equally apply to the proposed rates in Nyabad Keoramal. Briefly stated, the explanation is that the rates in 1845 were exceptionally low on account of special reasons.

35. Erinch is the largest pergunnah in the estate, and the proposed enhancement is 46·7 per cent.—nearly double the average enhancement in the Majnamuta estate. The Board, however, are quite satisfied that it can pay this with ease. At the former settlement Mr. Bayley remarked that it was, in fact, the best pergunnah in Jellamuta, and since then it has been greatly improved by the Tidal canal passing right through it. This has improved it in various ways. It enhances the value of the produce, brings trade to the doors of the inhabitants, and also to some extent improves the drainage as the canal officers have had to cut new drainage khals to take off the water wherever the canal crosses the drainage. The crops were tested both in 1875-76 and 1876-77, with the result of an average of 11 maunds 29 seers per bigha in the former, and 12 maunds 27 seers in the latter years. This gives the best results of any pergunnah. Mr. Price remarks in his report that—"the pergunnah is a prosperous one—no other in Hidgellee is better off: and the protective embankments have cost the Government a considerable sum in construction since the last settlement, and are very expensive to keep in proper repair." The outturn of his experiments fully bears out this opinion. The Board feel no hesitation in proposing to confirm the rates for Erinch.

36. Jellamuta is the pergunnah which presents the greatest difficulties; and while it appears that the whole of Jellamuta has been assessed somewhat less leniently than Majnamuta, it also appears clear that Jellamuta pergunnah has been assessed exceptionally—very exceptionally high—compared with the rest of the Jellamuta estate. This is partially explained by the history of its settlement. Baboo Bijoy Kissen Bose, the Deputy Collector, first deputed to assess the pergunnah, proposed an enhancement at the average rate of about 25 per cent.; but Mr. Price was dissatisfied with this, and had the rates raised to those now proposed. It was but natural that an error in the direction of leniency, in the first instance, should be succeeded by a similar error in the contrary direction.

37. That this error has been committed, at least relatively to the rest of the estate, seems perfectly plain from the following considerations. At the former settlement the average rate in Jellamuta was Rs. 1-3-6; in Erinch Rs. 1-2-9 per bigha. Jellamuta has not improved in circumstances since then, except, of course, in the price

of produce, while much might be said to show that from the neglect of its drainage channels it has deteriorated. Erinch has been intersected by the canal; and Mr. Price admits it to have improved relatively more than Jellamuta (*see* his letter quoted at paragraph 26); yet the rates in Jellamuta are enhanced 58 per cent. and in Erinch 46 per cent. only.

38. Mr. Price tested the crops in Jellamuta as in Erinch, and the results obtained were 12 maunds per bigha in 1875-76 (an excellent year for Jellamuta) and 8 maunds 32 seers in 1876-77, average 10 maunds 16 seers. He made similar tests in Erinch, and got 11 maunds 29 seers in 1875-76, and 12 maunds 27 seers in 1876-77; average 12 maunds 8 seers. At the former settlement the Jellamuta outturn was shown as 12 maunds and Erinch as 8 maunds. The Board would not attach much value to these figures; they can hardly believe that in the former settlement there was such a difference between the pergunnahs as the figures 12 and 8 would indicate, while the years selected for the measurements on the present settlement were notoriously favourable years, still the difference is very startling, especially as Mr. Price argues as if he put faith in his own figures. In Erinch, the productive powers of the soil increase 50 per cent., and the rates are raised 46 per cent. In Jellamuta, the productive powers decline 15 per cent., and the rents are enhanced 58 per cent. ! Erinch, again, is practically free from danger of inundation, while Jellamuta is necessarily flooded if the bunds of the Kaliaghye give way: they did give way in the year 1874, at the time of the cyclone, and the crops were entirely destroyed, and they have done so three or four times in the last 20 years.

39. Lastly, there is the drainage difficulty which formed the subject of a special report to Government in March 1877. In that letter the Board proposed to Government to spend, or at least advance, Rs. 12,444 to improve the drainage of Jellamuta pergunnah—

Board's No. 217A of the 21st March 1877.

“As in January 1876 the Settlement Officer of Midnapore, in reporting in connection with the assessments of the Jellamuta and Majnamuta estates in that district, represented that in pergunnah Jellamuta the result of the enhanced rate proposed by him would be an increase of 70 per cent. in the gross revenue of the estate, the lands of that pergunnah, however, being low and liable to inundation in seasons of excessive rainfall, the anticipated increase was stated to depend on the interior drainage of the pergunnah being placed on a proper footing.”

The Board solicit a reference to that letter, as also to the orders of Government in reply (10th April 1877) in which it is stated that, “it appears to His Honor as though Mr. Price was sensible that the enhanced rates fixed by him were too high if these improvements were carried out.”

40. It is but just to Mr. Price to add that he contended against this conclusion of the Lieutenant-Governor, and argued that even with the lands undrained as they are, they would pay the rates proposed, and the Board are even prepared to admit that, as a fact, these rates

could be demanded without positive injustice ; but the correspondence referred to leaves little room for doubt that the assessment in Jellamuta has not been a lenient assessment ; that Mr. Price contemplated its drainage being improved when he fixed these rates, and that he never suggested any *further* increase if the money had been spent and the khalls cleared out. The Board think it hardly possible therefore to resist the conclusion that relatively to other pergunnahs the assessment in Jellamuta is high.

41. When these facts were laid before Lord Ulick Browne he summoned Mr. Price to Calcutta to discuss the Jellamuta rates with him, and also asked for the benefit of Mr. Buckland's advice, who had been Commissioner of Burdwan during a portion of the time when the estate was under settlement. After conferring with Mr. Price, both Members were agreed that the rates in Jellamuta were too high to be proposed as a lenient assessment, such as Government would be disposed to sanction, and such as they have sanctioned for Majnamuta. It is quite evident that as these rates are not merely rates on the basis of which the sudder jumma is to be fixed, but also rates which it is proposed that the ryots shall be called upon to pay to the proprietors, and rates, too, which it is proposed to make binding upon them under the new Act, unless they successfully sue to set them aside, the actual state of the pergunnah is what has to be considered, and though the zemindars may be certainly to blame for allowing the drainage channels to silt up, that cannot make the ryots liable to pay a higher rent.

42. As regards the best method of reducing the rates in Jellamuta, it must be kept in view that the Board have no evidence of any kind before them of particular errors in classification of soils, or in the determination of their qualities and productive powers. All that they are able to determine in the absence of any individual complaints in appeal is that the *average* increase is above that which they like to recommend. Hence they have precisely the same ground for supposing it to be excessive in one class of land or one kind of soil as in another. The only logical conclusion therefore is that relief should be equally given to all ; and, after full consideration, the Board propose to reduce the rates in Jellamuta by two and a half annas in the rupee all round, or nearly one-sixth. This will reduce the average enhancement as compared with the previous assessment to about 33 per cent., and the corrections can be easily made without any difficulty.

43. There remains pergunnah Taraf Bisuan, the increase in which is 51 per cent. This is somewhat high, and the Board would have been glad to have found it lower, but there are circumstances which place it on an entirely different footing from Jellamuta. It is not like Erinch, Jellamuta, and other large pergunnahs, in a compact block, but is scattered among the other pergunnahs of Hidgellee. It thus fell to the lot of all three Deputy Collectors engaged in the settlement of Jellamuta to share in its assessment. In the case of Jellamuta the dissatisfaction of Mr. Price with the rates first fixed by the Deputy Collector affords a probable explanation of its being heavily assessed afterwards, whereas in Taraf Bisuan

there is no conceivable reason why it should have had harder measure meted out to it than the other pergunnahs in which it lies. The crop measurements gave an average of Rs. 10-6-10, against an average at the former settlement of Rs. 9-2-4. One of its largest fragments, too, has been considerably improved by the canal. It seems to the Board therefore that there are several guarantees that it has been equitably assessed, while to interfere with the assessment would be to introduce an element of confusion into the settlement of *all* the pergunnahs in which its lands lie. The Board therefore think that they can safely and justly recommend the rates of Taraf Bisuan to be left unaltered.

44. As regards rates other than those of rice lands, the Board would solicit a reference to paragraphs 31 and 32 of the Majnamuta report. The Board would, for the reasons there stated, let the rates for *bastu* and *dhasa* lands follow the rates for *jal* lands, confirming them in all other pergunnahs, but reducing them in the same proportion for Jellamuta.

45. *Interior drainage channels and gramblheries.*—In this estate, as in Majnamuta, the orders of Government of 5th July 1872, No. 2878, throwing upon ryots the obligation of repairing gramblheries, has in a great measure hindered the completion of the settlement. But Government has now in the correspondence noted on the margin accepted the liability of making an allowance for the cost of maintaining gramblheries and drainage channels wherever these are really required. The orders of Government have been communicated to the Commissioner.

Board's report No. 384A,
dated 4th June 1878.

Government order No.
7821, dated 6th July 1878.

46. *Classes of ryots.*—The Settlement Officer gives the following account of the ryots on the estate:—

“There are three classes of ryots in the estate—18,568 khoodkasht or resident ryots; 15,398 paikast or non-resident ryots, who have been in possession of their holdings for more than 12 years—both these classes enjoy rights of occupancy; and 696 non-resident ryots who have not been in possession for 12 years, and who have no rights of occupancy. The jumma of no class of ryots can be enhanced during the term of re-settlements. So long as a ryot, even of the third class, pays his rents he cannot be ousted by the zemindar; and even when he is ousted it can only be after legal proceedings and with the court's sanction. The ryots possess those rights which either they have always exercised, and which have come down to them from the last settlement (the privilege of selling or otherwise transferring their holdings being one of them) or rights which have accrued to them by legal enactment. So that the zemindars who are entitled to re-settlement cannot dispute the status of the ryots hereinbefore described.”

47. The Board have already expressed their views on the subject of ryots' rights in the Majnamuta report, and the orders of Government thereon, since received, will also govern the Jellamuta estate.

They have ascertained that no guarantee, authorized or unauthorized has yet been given to the ryots that their rents shall not be enhanced, during the period of the settlement, and there will therefore be no difficulty in giving effect to the orders of Government.

48. *Baruas*.—Nothing need be said here on the subject of these village officials called *baruas*. The question of their retention or abolition has been fully discussed in the Majnamuta report, and the orders of Government in that case will, it is presumed, apply equally to Jellamuta.

No. 167T, dated Darjeeling, the 21st October 1878.

From—A. MACKENZIE, Esq., Secretary to the Government of Bengal,
in charge Revenue and General Departments,

To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 701A, dated the 28th ultimo, reporting regarding the settlement of Jellamuta in Midnapore, and in reply to say that the Lieutenant-Governor entirely agrees with the Board in the conclusions to which they have come with reference to the rates of rent in the various pergunnahs of this estate, and accepts fully the reasoning leading up to those conclusions. The result will be that the Settlement Officer's rates for rice lands will be maintained in every pergunnah save Jellamuta, and in Jellamuta Mr. Price's rates will be reduced by $2\frac{1}{4}$ annas in the rupee all round. The rates for bastu and dhasa lands will follow as in Majnamuta the rates for jal lands, and be confirmed in all the pergunnahs save Jellamuta, where they will be reduced in the proportion named above.

2. All other points in connection with this settlement will be governed by the orders already given in connection with Majnamuta.

No. 808A, dated Calcutta, the 24th December 1879.

From—R. H. WILSON, Esq., Officiating Secretary to the Board of
Revenue, L. P.,

To—The Commissioner of the Burdwan Division.

WITH reference to your letter No. 1059, dated the 12th December 1879, submitting revised statement No. XX, and

* No. 578, dated 3rd
December 1879.

copy of a letter* from the Collector of Midnapore, reporting on the objections raised by the proprietors against the re-settlement of the Jellamuta estate, I am desired to state that the orders already passed regarding the condition on which gramhbhery allowance is to be allowed cannot be modified, and the Board see no reason for allowing or proposing in this estate a larger consolidated allowance to the proprietors than is usually granted in similar cases under the general orders of Government.

2. The only modifications the Board think it necessary to make are—(a) the omission of all provision for putwaries, Government having recently decided that in Bengal Proper the maintenance of putwaries is not to be required; and (b) an increase of the allowance to the proprietors for collection expenses in the case of resumed lakhiraj lands from 10 to 15 per cent. as in the case of the Majnamuta estate.

3. These changes will necessitate a revision of table C of statement No. XX as shown below. The statement in the Board's

office has been corrected accordingly, and the copies in your and the Collector's offices should be similarly corrected—

	1287, A.S.	1288, A.S.	1289, A.S.	1290, A.S.	1291 to 1307, A. S.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1. Assets assumed as the basis of settlement.	2,25,113 0 4½	2,25,130 7 4½	2,25,220 4 4½	2,25,208 2 4½	2,25,304 14 3½
2. Deduct collection expenses and proprietary allowance at 30 per cent.	67,533 14 6	67,541 13 5	67,568 12 6	67,589 7 1	67,591 7 5½
3. Remainder Rs. A. P.	1,57,579 1 10½	1,57,597 9 11½	1,57,660 7 10½	1,57,708 11 3½	1,57,713 6 9½
4. Add the assessment of cultivated khas patit 404 10 10					
5. Deduct proprietary allowance at 30 per cent. 121 6 5					
	283 4 5	283 4 5	283 4 5	283 4 5	283 4 5
6. Total	1,57,862 6 3½	1,57,880 14 4½	1,57,943 12 3½	1,57,991 15 8½	1,57,996 11 2½
7. Add half rental assessment resumed o rent-free lands ... 9,476 6 6½					
8. Deduct collection expenses at 15 per cent ... 1,421 7 4½					
9. Remainder 8,054 15 2					
10. Add to avoid fractions ... 0 0 10					
	8,055 0 0	8,055 0 0	8,055 0 0	8,055 0 0	8,055 0 0
11. Total	1,65,917 6 3½	1,65,935 14 4½	1,65,998 12 3½	1,66,046 15 8½	1,66,051 11 2½
12. Add or deduct to avoid fractions	0 6 3½	0 1 7½	0 3 8½	0 0 3½	0 4 9½
13. Total or remainder ...	1,65,917 0 0	1,65,936 0 0	1,65,999 0 0	1,66,047 0 0	1,66,052 0 0

NOTE.—The item 8, remainder of the assessment of cultivated khas patit in the original table C was erroneously added to the half-rental assessment of resumed rent-free lands and a second deduction of 10 per cent. made thereon on account of collection charges. This has now been corrected.

4. The net revenue demandable having thus been fixed at Rs. 1,65,917, the Collector should make a formal offer of the settlement to the proprietors from the beginning of the Amli year 1287 in September 1879. In making this offer he should call upon them, in the event of their being unwilling to accept the settlement, subject to this amount of revenue, to state under clause 3, section V, Regulation VII of 1822, the highest amount of jumma for the payment of which they may be willing to engage. A reasonable time should be fixed within which a reply is to be given. If no definite reply be received by that date, the proprietors must be understood to have refused, and the estate can then be brought under khas management under section III, Regulation VII of 1822. The result of the offer should be reported to the Board, and proposals made as to the rate of malikana to be allowed under section V, Regulation VII of 1822.

No. 1373, dated Chinsurah, the 20th February 1880.

From—T. E. RAVENSHAW, Esq., Commissioner of the Burdwan Division,
To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

IN reply to your No. 808A of 24th December 1879, I have the honour to submit report from Collector of Midnapore, No. 78S, dated 13th February 1880, together with translation of the Jellamuta proprietors' petition. This virtually declines settlement on any terms until the settlement rates have been enforced. Under the circumstances I recommend that orders may issue authorising assumption of khas management. The subject of malikana allowance to be made will be separately reported after reference to the Collector.

No. 78S, dated Midnapore, the 13th February 1880.

From—J. C. PRICE, Esq., Offg. Collector of Midnapore,
To—The Commissioner of Revenue, Burdwan Division.

WITH reference to the Board's letter No. 808A of the 24th December last, forwarded to me with your memorandum No. 736 of the 26th idem, I have the honour to submit herewith a translation of the petition presented by the proprietors of the Jellamuta estate in compliance with my call made on them with a view to induce them to accept settlement at the jumma revised by the Board. It will appear therefrom that the proprietors will not accept settlement until the rates are wholly acquiesced in by the ryots. I therefore beg to suggest that the estate be brought under the management of Government at once, as proposed by me in my letter No. 57S of the 3rd December last.

To—THE COLLECTOR OF MIDNAPORE.

The humble petition of Srimati Rani Hari-
priya and Srimati Rani Anandamoyi,
zemindars of estate Jellamuta.

SHEWETH—

THAT the petitioners were served with notices directing them to report their willingness to accept the revised maximum jumma of Rs. 1,66,052. That they have no objection whatever to accept settlement, as they have previously reported to you. That they consent to agree to take settlement at the jumma which will be willingly accepted by the ryots. They therefore pray that their former objections be decided, and that the settlement be concluded with them on the jumma acquiesced in by the ryots, after allowing them malikana, collection expenses, and allowances for the maintenance and repairs of gramhberies at the rates hitherto paid to them.

No. 146A, dated Calcutta, the 2nd March 1880.

From—H. J. S. COTTON, Esq., Offg. Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
Lower Provinces,

To—The Commissioner of Burdwan.

WITH reference to your letter No. 1373, dated 20th February 1880, submitting copy of a letter, with enclosure, from the Collector of

Midnapore, reporting that the proprietors of the Jellamuta estate decline to accept the settlement on the terms offered, and recommending that the estate may be brought under khas management, I am desired to say that it will now be necessary for the Collector to assume direct management of this estate under section 3, Regulation VII of 1882, and to assign malikana to the proprietors under section 5 of that regulation.

2. The Collector has reported elsewhere that, although the enhancement under the jumabundis and notices which have been issued upon the ryots might take effect retrospectively from the beginning of the current year, under section 12, Bengal Act VIII of 1879, yet the proprietors of the estate have been collecting rents for the year, and giving receipts at the old rates. Care must be taken to avoid the confusion from their having done so, and not to allow the questions to arise which arose in adjusting the malikana of the Majnamuta estate, in which there was a difficulty as to the mode of dealing with rents which fell due between the date on which the last instalment of revenue had been due from the proprietors, and the date on which charge of the estate was assumed by the Collector. To avoid this difficulty it will be desirable for the Collector to declare the estate under his management from a date following that on which same instalment of revenue becomes due from the proprietors.

3. The effect will be that the proprietors will remain liable for all instalments of revenue which may have fallen due before that date; and that they will be entitled to collect all rents which may have fallen due up to that date. If they choose not to take advantage of the enhancement for the period for which they are entitled to collect, they can forego the enhanced rents for that period, but this will not prevent the Collector from enforcing the enhanced rates for the remainder of the year.

4. It may be necessary to remind the Collector that he will not be entitled to demand payment of revenue on the estate from the proprietors at the increased rate from the beginning of the year; the revenue from the beginning of the current year up to the date on which the Collector may assume charge of the estate must be accepted and levied, if necessary, at the old rate of the settlement which has lately expired.

5. You are now requested to report on what dates the different instalments of revenue of the Jellamuta estate become due to Government, the last day of payment for each instalment, the amount of each, and the date on which you would propose that the Collector should take charge of the estate. It will of course be necessary to give ample previous notice of such date to the ryots of the estate by proclamation throughout the estate and otherwise, and to warn the ryots that instalments of rent falling due from and after that date must be paid to the Collector or to some person authorized by the Collector, and not to any one else.

No. 325A.

Endorsed by—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

COPY forwarded to the Collector of Midnapore direct to save time, with reference to his letter No. 78S, dated 13th February 1880,

and its enclosure, and with a request that he will submit his report to the Commissioner of Burdwan with as little delay as possible.

No. 296K, dated Midnapore, the 15th March 1880.
From—J. C. PRICE, Esq., Offg. Collector of Midnapore,
To—The Commissioner of Revenue, Burdwan Division.

WITH reference to paragraph 5 of letter No. 146A, dated 2nd instant, from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, to your address, (a copy of which has been forwarded to me with the Secretary's memorandum No. 325A of the same date), communicating the orders of the Board to bring the Jellamuta estate under direct management under section 3, Regulation VII of 1822, I have the honour to submit herewith a statement showing the months in which the different instalments of revenue of the estate become due to Government, the last day of payment for each instalment, and its amount. In this statement I have also specified the fixed monthly kistibundi which regulates the payment of rent by the ryots of Jellamuta and other estates in Hidgellee.

2. Of the four instalments payable by the proprietors of the estate in each Amli year, the first, which falls on the 12th January, follows a 5-annas towjih due from the ryots for the three months Assin to Agrahayan; the second, which falls on the 28th March, follows a 7-annas towjih for the next three months, Pous to Phalgun; the third, which falls on the 28th June, follows a 3-annas 6 pie towjih for the next three months, Chaitra to Jaisthya; and the fourth, which is due on the 28th September, follows the remaining 6-pies towjih for the last three months, Assar, Sraban, and Bhadra.

3. As Phalgun has already expired, and as the 28th March, corresponding with the 17th Chaitra Amli, is the last day for payment of the last instalment of the current financial year, I consider it expedient to bring the estate under khas management from the 30th of March. Under this arrangement the rents of 12 annas towjih of the current Amli year 1287 will become payable by the ryots to the proprietors, and the remaining 4 annas will be due to Government. I hope this proposal will meet the approval of the Board, in anticipation of which I propose to issue the necessary notifications all over the estate; that is, the ryots will be warned that the rents due for the last 4 annas towjih of the year 1287 must not be paid by them to the zemindars, but to the agency which will be hereafter employed in collecting rents in the estate.

4. I may here add that the zemindars may have an objection to urge against my recommendation. Whereas they will be able to collect only 12 annas portion of the rents due from their ryots, they will have paid a 13-annas towjih on the 28th March. But no possible arrangement can be made which will exactly assimilate the ryots' kistibundi with the instalments of Government revenue.

Memo. No. 297K, dated Midnapore, the 15th March 1880.
Endorsed by—J. C. PRICE, Esq., Offg. Collector of Midnapore.

COPY submitted to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

Statement showing the months in which the different instalments of revenue of the Jellamuta estate become due to Government, the last day of payment for each instalment, and the amount thereof; also a specification of the fixed monthly kistibundi which regulates the payment of rents by the ryots of the estate to the proprietors.

ZEMINDARS' KISTIBUNDI.				RYOTS' KISTIBUNDI.			
Months in which each instalment of revenue is payable.	Last day of payment for each instalment.	Amount of each instalment.	Remarks.	Names of months.	Towjih.	REMARKS.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
		Rs. A. P.			Rs. A. P.		
January of each year	12th January	33,772 0 0	{ Assin Kartick Agrahayan	{ 0 1 0 0 1 6 0 2 6	{ The 5 annas towjih of this quarter falls within 12th January, on which date Rs. 33,772 or 5 annas 6 pies towjih of the annual revenue of the estate, is due from the proprietors. The 7 annas towjih of this quarter falls within 28th March, on which date Rs. 46,053 or 7 annas 8 pies towjih of the annual revenue of the estate, is due from the proprietors. The 3 annas 6 pies towjih of this quarter falls within 28th June, on which date Rs. 11,536-4, or 1 anna 9 pies towjih of the annual revenue of the estate including Rs. 491-4 on account of road fund, is due from the proprietors. The 6 pies towjih of this quarter falls within 28th September, on which date Rs. 8,166-4, or 1 anna 3 pies towjih of the annual revenue of the estate, including Rs. 491-4 on account of road fund, is due from the proprietors.	
March of	28th March	46,053 0 0	{ Pous Mach Phalgun	{ 0 2 6 0 3 0 0 1 6		
June of	28th June	11,536 4 0	{ This amount in- cludes road fund of Rs. 491-4.	{ Chaitra Vaisakh Jyesthya	{ 0 1 6 0 1 0 0 1 0		
September of	28th September	8,166 4 0	Ditto ditto	{ Assar Srawan Bhadra	{ 0 0 6		
	Total	98,227 8 0 inclusive of Rs. 982-8 on account of road fund.			1 0 0		

J. C. PRICE,
Offg. Collector.

No. 298K, dated Midnapore, the 16th March 1880.

From—J. C. PRICE, Esq., Offg. Collector of Midnapore,
To—The Commissioner of Revenue, Burdwan Division.

IN my letter No. 296K of yesterday's date I reported to you that the Jellamuta estate should be brought under khas management from the 29th of March. I am now made aware that the 28th instant will be Sunday, and the last day for payment of the last instalment of Government revenue of the estate for the current financial year will fall on the 29th idem. The khas management should begin from the 30th. Necessary notifications will accordingly be issued all over the estate.

Memo. No. 229K, dated Midnapore, the 16th March 1880.

Endorsed by—J. C. PRICE, Esq., Offg. Collector of Midnapore.

COPY submitted to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces, in continuation of this office letter No. 297K of yesterday's date.

No. 205A, dated Calcutta, the 22nd March 1880.

From—H. J. S. CORROX, Esq., Offg. Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
Lower Provinces,
To—The Commissioner of Burdwan.

IN continuation of my letter No. 146A, dated 2nd March 1880, I am directed to say that the Board approve of the proposals made by the Collector of Midnapore in his letter No. 296K of the 15th idem, to your address, a copy of which has been sent direct to the Board for assuming direct management of the Jellamuta estate, the charge of the estate being taken from the 30th March 1880, as proposed in Mr. Price's letter No. 298K, dated 16th instant.

2. To avoid delay a copy of this letter will be sent direct to the Collector.

No. 417A.

Endorsed by—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P.

COPY forwarded to the Collector of Midnapore for information and guidance, with reference to his memorandums Nos. 297K and 299K, dated, respectively, the 15th and 16th March 1880.

No. 1476, dated Chinsurah, the 23rd March 1880.

From—T. E. RAVENSHAW, Esq., Commissioner of Burdwan,
To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P.

IN reply to the latter part of your 808A of 24th December 1879, and with reference to Board's orders 146A of 2nd March, directing assumption of management of Jellamuta estate, I have the honour to state that the malikana allowance under clause 2, section 5, of Regulation VII of 1822 should be at some rate between 5 and 10 per cent. on the net amount realized by Government.

In the Majnamuta estate, which is similarly situated, 10 per cent. is the allowance fixed. I therefore recommend that 10 per cent. malikana may be sanctioned in Jellamuta also.

No. 219A, dated Calcutta, the 2nd April 1880.

From—H. J. S. Corron, Esq., Officiating Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P.,

To—The Commissioner of Burdwan.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 1476, dated the 23rd March 1880, and in reply to say that the Board sanction 10 per cent. on the net collections of the Jellamuta estate as the malikana allowance to be paid to the proprietors of the estate during its khas management.

No. 483A, dated Fort William, the 13th July 1880.

From—H. J. S. Corron, Esq., Officiating Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P.

To—The Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Revenue Department.

WITH reference to reminder No. 1872A—736LR, dated 23rd June 1880, calling for the submission of final report of the settlement of the Jellamuta estate in Midnapore, I am directed to say that, notwithstanding the reduction allowed in Government order No. 167T, dated 21st October 1878, of two and a half annas in the rupee in the jumma of the estate, which had the effect of reducing the net amount of demandable revenue as detailed in the statement enclosed, the proprietors refused to accept settlement unless the rates were enforced from the ryots under Government supervision and with the assistance of Government officers, and the estate has accordingly been brought under khas management from the 30th March 1880.

No. 192A, dated Calcutta, the 19th April 1882.

From—H. J. S. Corron, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L.P.,

To—The Commissioner of the Burdwan Division.

IN your predecessor's letter No. 1476, dated 23rd March 1880, it was represented that the malikana allowance payable to the proprietors of the Jellamuta estate should be calculated at some rate between 5 and 10 per cent. "on the net collections," and it was added that "in the Majnamuta estate, which is similarly situated, 10 per cent is the allowance fixed. I therefore recommend that 10 per cent malikana may be sanctioned in Jellamuta also."

2. In reply, the Board in my No. 219A, dated 2nd April 1880, sanctioned "10 per cent. on the net collections of the Jellamuta estate as the malikana to be paid to the proprietors of the estate during its khas management." But these orders were passed under the misapprehension that, as represented by your predecessor, Jellamuta was situated exactly as Majnamuta was when the orders determining the mode of calculation for malikana were passed. This was not the case, for Majnamuta was then held under attachment in accordance with Regulation IX of 1825.

3. The Jellamuta estate was brought under khas management from the 30th March 1880. Under clause 3, section 5, Regulation VII

* Collector's No. 78T,
dated 13th February 1880.

of 1822, the proprietors were called on by the Collector* to state the highest jumma for which they might be willing to engage; but when they failed "to specify and tender any sum," the estate was taken under khas management.† The circumstances of the case are there-

† Board's No. 205A.
dated 22nd March 1880.

fore exactly similar to that of the Majnamuta estate after, but not before, March 1880. It has been pointed out in my letter No. 191A of to-day's date, to your address, that the malikana in such a case should not be calculated on the net collections of the estate. The provisions of clause 3, section 5, Regulation VII of 1822 are applicable to the Jellamuta as well as to the Majnamuta estate. In Jellamuta also the malikana must be calculated on the net revenue derived by Government from the estate on account of the year preceding that in which the Collector called on the proprietors to engage. In the Jellamuta estate the net revenue of the year preceding is the jumma of the old settlement, *viz.* Rs. 98,245, and road fund Rs. 982-8—total Rs. 99,227-8—and the proprietors are therefore entitled to malikana on this sum for such time as the estate is now held by Government. It has already been decided that malikana shall be calculated at the rate of 10 per cent.

4. These orders will take effect from the date of the assumption of charge of the estate, and any payments which may already have been made should be adjusted in accordance with them.

PART III.

CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING GRAMBHERIES AND DRAINAGE CHANNELS.

No. 221A, dated Fort William, the 3rd April 1879.

From—H. L. HARRISON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L.P.,
To—The Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Revenue Department.

WITH reference to Government order No. 782T, dated 6th July

From Commissioner of Burdwan,
No. 814, dated 11th December 1878, and
enclosure.

Board's reply No. 15A, dated 7th
January 1879.

Commissioner's rejoinder No. 1061,
dated 18th February 1879.

in the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates in the Midnapore district.

2. It will be seen that, under the settlement of 1845, the amount

	Rs.
Majnamuta	2,854
Doro Dumnun	2,734
Naruanuta	417
Kismut Pataspore	357
Baliyora	349
Datta Khoroi	230
Sarifabad	127
Amirabad	90
	7,158

Jellamuta	1,901
Tutaf Erunch	2,215
„ Bisan	1,278
Banda Bazar	63
Pataspore	323
Nyabad	61
Bhograi	462
Khalsa Bhograi	135
Kalindi Balshahi	451
	6,889

Total 14,047

1878, and subsequent reminders, I am desired to submit a copy of the correspondence noted on the margin, regarding the allowance to be made for the maintenance of grammbheries and drainage channels in certain pergunnahs in the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates in the Midnapore district. actually allowed on account of grammbheries was 5 per cent. on the gross mofussil assets of *mal* lands in eight pergunnahs in Majnamuta and nine pergunnahs in Jellamuta. Nothing was allowed in the remaining three pergunnahs of Majnamuta or in the remaining pergunnah of Jellamuta, and also nothing was allowed on the *resumed lakhiraj* lands. The allowances therefore amounted to Rs. 7,158 in the former, and to Rs. 6,889 in the latter, as shown on the margin. The Government (paragraph 3 of their letter of 6th July last) anticipate that it will not probably be necessary to grant as much as 5 per cent. even on the old jumma, and that certainly nothing like 5 per cent. on the jumma now fixed

should be given; but the Commissioner's letter and its enclosures show that this anticipation will not be realized. Mr. Price's calculation and estimates, which are given in statement B of that letter, show that Rs. 12,159 will be required annually for the repairs and maintenance of grammbheries and drainage channels in 10 out of the 11 pergunnahs in Majnamuta, and Rs. 9,383 in nine out of the 10 pergunnahs in Jellamuta, or a total of Rs. 21,542.

3. The Board were much surprised at the high estimate made, and were disposed to think that Mr. Price had included in it every grammbhery in the two estates, or at least many grammbheries that were practically unnecessary; and it was thought that, if a judicious selection

had been made, many of them might have been dispensed with. Further information was accordingly obtained from Mr. Price demi-officially as to the principle of the selection made, and he was requested to report whether any proper enquiry had been made, and whether any competent officer had satisfied himself that all the grambheries included in his estimate were really useful. A copy of Mr. Price's memorandum in reply is annexed, and it will be seen that he states that the five Deputy and Sub-Deputy Collectors, who were engaged on the settlement of these two estates, had made careful enquiries into the matter, and he is not prepared to say that a single grambhery included in the estimate could be said to be useless. The estimate, Mr. Price thinks, cannot well be reduced. In fact, he states that any further enquiries into the question, whether grambhery requirements are adequately met, will more probably result in an increase than a decrease, and nothing could be brought to light that was not already known and well considered.

4. It must be remembered that the price of labour has risen very much during the last 40 years—probably as much as the value of produce and more than the increase of rent which the Board have felt justified in recommending. Mr. Dampier submits therefore that, unless the allowance at the former settlement was very excessive and altogether over-estimated, an assumption for which there are no grounds, we ought not to be surprised at the result of Mr. Price's enquiries which afford some kind of corroboration indeed of the equity of the former allowance.

5. It seems to the Board therefore that two proposals may reasonably be made—(1) to grant the precise allowances recommended by Mr. Price, aggregating Rs. 21,542, in lieu of the old allowance of Rs. 14,047; the other to grant an allowance calculated precisely as before, *viz.*, at 5 per cent. on the gross *mal* assets of eight pergunnahs in one estate and nine pergunnahs in the other. This calculation will be found in column 11 of statement C annexed to the Commissioner's letter, and the total amounts to Rs. 22,265, or about Rs. 700 more.

6. It is quite possible, however, that the rents may be reduced in the course of the proceedings, connected with the endeavour which is now being made to enforce them, even under the new Settlement Officers' Bill; so that it cannot at present be foreseen with certainty which of the two systems will be most economical.

7. All things considered, therefore, it seems to Mr. Dampier that it will be better and more equitable to adopt the estimates prepared by Mr. Price. The Government, in its letter under reply, desire "that it should be distinctly stated what grambheries are really required, and only these should be maintained." This, it will be seen from his memorandum, Mr. Price has done, and in the settlement of each pergunnah a list of the grambheries which required to be kept up is given. This list contains grambheries in two pergunnahs of Majnamuta—Kismut Shipore and Majna Nyabad—which received no allowance at the last settlement, and, if they have to be kept up, the zemindars will urge that an allowance ought to be made on the *mal* assets of those pergunnahs also.

8. On the other hand, if these gramhberies are struck out of the list on the plea that no allowance was made at the last settlement, it will place the Government in the position of not adhering to the opinions of its Settlement Officers, and it will be difficult to refuse to re-open the question if it is complained that other gramhberies, which ought to have been included, have been omitted.

9. On the whole therefore it will greatly simplify matters if the Settlement Officers' lists and estimates are accepted, and the allowance granted accordingly. The Collector will then have a definite and authoritative list to be guided by if complaints are made of neglect of repairs, and the obligations of the zemindars also will be definite and ascertainable. If the ryots claim the repairs of any gramhbhery not included in the list, it will be easy to point this out, and to insist on their doing any repairs they wish at their own expense.

10. The Board therefore would recommend that the allowances shown in annexure B to the Commissioner's letter of the 7th December may be sanctioned, amounting in all to Rs. 12,159 for Majnamuta, and Rs. 9,383 for Jellamuta. This last amount includes Rs. 91 for Keoramal Nyabad, which is only an estimate of Mr. Price's, as he had sent away the original papers and had not access to them when writing his report. As it would delay this report very much to have those papers traced out and referred to, and as the amount is so small, the Board recommend that Mr. Price's estimate may be taken as the correct amount for this pergunnah without further reference.

No. 814, dated Howrah, the 11th December 1878.

From—F. H. PELLEW, Esq., Offg. Commr. of the Burdwan Division,
To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

I HAVE the honour, in reference to your No. 484A of the 19th July, and subsequent reminders, to submit a copy of No. 100, dated 8th August, from the Officiating Settlement Officer, Midnapore, with the statements purporting to show the amounts proposed to be allowed to the zemindars in the temporarily-settled estates of Majnamuta and Jellamuta for the maintenance of gramhberies and drainage channels.

2. It is first necessary to explain why this has not been submitted earlier.

3. The statements, as originally submitted, were full of errors in calculation and were unintelligible. Column 7 of statement C purported to show a deduction of one-fifth of the amount shown in column 6 for the gramhbhery allowance, whereas it was clear that the amount shown should have been one-eighth of the total allowance of 40 per cent. These errors were doubtless owing to Mr. Price's anxiety to complete the statements before making over charge of the office, but they necessitated the return of them and revision in the Collector's office. They were again re-submitted on the 23rd September; but I was once more obliged to return them on account of serious discrepancies in the figures. Lastly, they were submitted on the 29th November.

4. I have made a few minor revisions, with a view to reconciling discrepancies due to an imperfect method of dealing with fractions,

but the statements, as now submitted, are substantially the statements which Mr. Price intended to submit.

5. I am particular in mentioning this, because it does not appear to me that the statements are exactly what are required by the orders of Government and the Board; at the same time, as they embody the Settlement Officer's views on the subject of these allowances, they clearly require to be submitted to the Board. Statement A shows the former allowance as computed in the settlement office by the somewhat round-about method of taking one-eighth of the total allowance of 40 per cent. on gross assets allowed to the zemindars under the settlement of 1845. It shows that Rs. 7,161 were allowed for Majnamuta, and Rs. 6,898 for Jellamuta. Statement B is the result of the enquiries made by the Settlement Officer and his subordinates during settlement, and shows the amount which, in their opinion, ought to be expended in grambheries and drainage channels respectively in each pergunnah, except Keoramal Nyabad of estate Jellamuta, the reasons for omitting which are explained. It includes three pergunnahs—Kismut Shipore, Majna Nyabad, and Gaomesh—for which no allowance was made formerly. In some pergunnahs a greater sum, and in others a less sum, is estimated than the former allowance. But on the whole the amount exceeds the old allowance by more than 70 per cent. in the case of Majnamuta.

6. In statement C the Settlement Officer has simply calculated 5 per cent. on the gross assets under the new settlement and shown them in column 11. The amount shown for Majnamuta is somewhat less than was shown as requisite in statement B, and the amount in Jellamuta somewhat more, as follows—

		Amount required. Rs.	Amount at 5 per cent. on <i>mal jumma</i> . Rs. A. P.
Majnamuta	...	12,159	10,582 7 10
Jellamuta	...	9,382*	11,682 15 0

7. The great elaboration of figures shown in this statement is unintelligible and perplexing. In reality the amounts shown in columns 6 and 7 are merely 40 per cent. and 5 per cent. respectively on those shown in column 3. Columns 4 and 5 are unmeaning, as it would appear that the half-rental on resumed lands was not taken into the account of gross assets for the purpose of calculating the allowances to the proprietors, and column 6, which shows the total allowance of 40 per cent., is not required. Again, column 11 shows simply 5 per cent. on the figures in column 8, and columns 9 and 10 are inserted without any apparent object.

8. On perusing the Board's report to Government and the orders of Government passed thereon, I note the following points as important in regard to the present matter.

9. In paragraph 3 of the Board's report it is noted that 5 per cent. of the gross assets were allowed to the proprietors for keeping in order the grambheries in six pergunnahs, *viz.* :—

Majnamuta.	Datta Khoroi.
Doro Duman.	Amirabad.
Balijora.	Kismut Pataspore.

* After adding Rs. 90 for Keoramal Nyabad.

But in paragraph 29 it is explained that, although no special provision was made for *jalnikashi* or interior drainage channels in the settlement of 1845, yet, in fact, the settlement-holders have at any rate professed to keep in order both the *grambheries* and the *jalnikashi*, and that the *ryots* look to them for the execution of the work; and in paragraph 30 the Board express the opinion that on the whole the best solution will be to continue the arrangement made at the last settlement, with such additional securities as may be practicable, *viz.*, that a Bill should be submitted and passed by the Commissioner on a certificate that the *grambheries*, as well as the *jalnikashi*, have not been neglected.

10. From this I understand that it was the intention of the Board that the old allowance, whatever it might have amounted to, was to be continued to the *zemindar* on the understanding that they should keep up both the *grambheries* and the *jalnikashi* as they had always proposed to do (though not bound by the actual terms of the settlement to keep up both).

11. On this the Government passed orders that they accepted the Board's view that the Government must admit the liability to bear the cost of the *grambheries* and the drainage channels whenever these are really required. They required that it should be distinctly stated in the settlement proceedings what *grambheries* were really required, and only those should be maintained at Government cost. They assumed that the real cost, when thus strictly examined into, would not amount to 5 per cent. even on the old *jumma*, and certainly not to anything like 5 per cent. on the enhanced *jumma*; and finally asked what the amount should be.

12. It appears to me that in this the Government did not entirely and completely assent to the Board's proposition that the old allowance should be continued. They wished a searching examination into the extent of annual repairs required, and a fixing of the amount for each work on the understanding that in this way the total amount would be found less than the old allowance of 5 per cent., or at least not greater than that allowance.

13. The reply to the Board's call for report on this is, as it appears to me, contained in Mr. Price's statement B. He therein shows the amount which, in his opinion, is required for the works in each *pergunnah*. It amounts to a great deal more than Government supposed likely. It amounts to one-third more than the old allowance, the continuance of which was asked for by the Board. The old allowance,

as computed (for it is evidently a computation merely) by Mr. Price, and including two *pergunnahs* which really received no *grambhery* allowance at all* under the old settlement, *viz.*, Sarifabad and Naruamuta, amounts to Rs. 14,056, and the amount proposed as necessary (including Rs. 90 for Keoramal Nyabad) comes to no less than Rs. 21,541.

14. It therefore becomes a question whether the Board will not prefer to address Government again on the subject, and ask for the continuance of the old allowance which it does not appear was ever complained of as being too low.

15. If this view of the subject be correct, statement C, which shows a still larger amount, *viz.*, Rs. 22,265, calculated at 5 per cent.

* (Unless there be some error in the Board's report—margin of paragraph 3).

on the new gross assets, is altogether superfluous. Under the Board's report the amount recommended is 5 per cent. on the old gross assets of six pergunnahs of Majnamuta—

					Rs.
Majnamuta	2,854
Doro Dumnán	2,734
Balijsora	349
Datta Khoroi	230
Amirabad	90
Kismut Pataspore	357
Total				...	6,614

and say Rs. 6,898 in Jellamuta; total Rs. 13,512.

Under Government orders this amount, or such less sum as might on enquiry be found sufficient, was sanctioned. But the Settlement Officer has proposed a rate per centum on the new gross assets, which is not only beyond the actual requirements, but is distinctly mentioned only to be rejected in the Government orders.

16. There appear to be two courses open—either to accept Mr. Price's estimates of the actual requirements of the works and to sanction the sums shown in statement B for each pergunnah, or to make the old allowance (so far as it can be ascertained) not in the form of a percentage but in the form of a fixed sum for each pergunnah in addition to the malikana and collection charges.

17. There is of course a third course, *viz.*, to order a re-investigation of the expenditure necessary on grammbheries and interior drainage channels, but I cannot recommend this as it is just as likely to result in a larger as in a smaller estimate.

18. Nor would I recommend a fourth course, *viz.*, to cut down each of Mr. Price's pergunnah estimates by one-third, and so bring the total amount down to the level of the old allowance. Some argument might doubtless be found for this, inasmuch as it would apportion the amount more fairly in accordance with existing requirements.

19. But on the whole I would recommend that the old allowance should be carefully ascertained from the papers of the settlement of 1845 (and not merely, as has been done, by taking one-eighth of the total allowance to zemindars which seems to lead to discrepancies) and continued with the safeguards proposed. This course appears to me the least likely to lead to complaint or give ground for neglect.

No. 100, dated Midnapore, the 8th August 1878.

From—J. C. PRICE, Esq., Officiating Settlement Officer of Midnapore,
To—The Commissioner of Revenue, Burdwan Division.

WITH reference to your memorandum No. 390, dated 29th July 1878, forwarding copy of the Board's letter No. 484A, dated 19th idem, to your address, on the subject of the annual cost to be incurred by Government in the repairs and maintenance of the grammbheries and interior drainage channels in the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates in Hidgellce, I have the honour to submit two statements—A and B. In statement A I have shown the amounts allowed according to the

terms of the last settlement for the repairs and maintenance of gram-bheries only, in eight of the 11 pergunnahs of the Majnamuta estate, and in nine of the 10 pergunnahs of the Jellamuta estate. In the proposed re-settlement reports and ruidads of the several pergunnahs of the two estates, the subordinate Settlement Officers, according to instructions issued by me during the progress of the re-settlement proceedings, have given a particular account of the various gram-bheries and drainage channels, the maintaining which in proper condition was ascertained to be essentially necessary for the proper and seasonable cultivation of the lands. Estimates were also made of the annual expenditure likely to be incurred for the purpose, the quantity of earthwork that would have to be done being shown. Statement B is an abstract of the subordinate Settlement Officers' proposals on this subject, which were reported by me for confirmation in my several pergunnahwaree reports.

2. The proposed total expenditure for repairs and maintenance of gram-bheries and interior drainage channels in the Majnamuta estate amounts to Rs. 12,159, and in the Jellamuta estate to Rs. 9,292.

3. In statement C are given details to admit of a comparison being made between the jummas and the percentage thereof granted as gram-bhery allowance at the last settlement with the jummas now proposed and a similar percentage thereof for a similar object. The figures arrived at by a calculation of 5 per cent. on the proposed jummas differ somewhat from the figures given in paragraph 2; if the former are below the latter in the case of Majnamuta, they exceed them in the case of Jellamuta.

4. Both sets of figures represent an expenditure which will, in all probability, be accounted excessive by Government; but, as the subordinate settling officers were intimately acquainted with the requirements of the several pergunnahs entrusted to them for settlement, and made careful local enquiries to ascertain what was the exact amount of the work that would have to be annually gone through, I cannot venture to propose a less expenditure than they reported to be necessary.

A.

Former allowance on account of the repairs and maintenance of gram-bheries in the undermentioned pergunnahs of the Majnamuta and Jellamuta Estates.

No.	Names of pergunnahs.			Amount.		
				Rs.	A.	P.
1.	Majnamuta	2,855	0	0
2.	Doro Dumnan	2,735	0	0
3.	Sarifabad	127	0	0
4.	Bali-jora	349	0	0
5.	Datta Khoroi	230	0	0
6.	Amirabad	50	0	0
7.	Kismut Pataspore	357	0	0
8.	Naruamuta	417	0	0
Total				7,161	0	0

No.	Names of pergunnalis.	Amount.		
		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	Jellamuta	1,901	0	0
2.	Taraf Erinch	2,216	0	0
3.	„ Bisuan	1,279	0	0
4.	Bainda Bazar	64	0	0
5.	Paharpore	323	0	0
6.	Keoramal Nyabad	61	0	0
7.	Bhograi	464	0	0
8.	Khalsa Bhograi	136	0	0
9.	Kalindi Balsbahi	452	0	0
Total		6,896	0	0

B.

Statement showing the allowances proposed to be given in this re-settlement for the repairs and maintenance of grambheries and drainage channels.

Number.	NAMES OF PER-GUNNAHS.	Rate per 1,000 cubic feet of earth.	GRAMBHERY.		DRAINAGE CHANNEL.		Total (columns 5 and 7).
			Length in feet.	Estimated annual expenditure.	Length in feet.	Estimated annual expenditure.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Rs. A. P.		Rs.		Rs.	Rs.
1	Majnamuta	1 0 0	13,33,264	1,000	1,22,664	1,227	5,227
2	Doro Dumnun	Rs. 20 per mile in length were estimated by Mr. Mendies.	5,28,900	1,999	2,65,000	501	2,500
3	Sarifabad	1 0 0	65,272	196	1,688	47	1,735
4	Kismut Shipore	1 0 0	19,436	58	No drainage channels required.		58
5	Majna Nyabad	1 0 0	28,451	85	Ditto ditto		85
6	Bahjora	1 0 0	6,65,545	661	28,014	50	714
7	Datta Khoroi	1 0 0	1,20,580	542	9,470	15	557
8	Anurabad	1 0 0	42,916	193	19,458	25	218
9	Kismut Pataspore	1 0 0	1,94,657	893	26,940	98	991
10	Narumuta	Rs. 10 per mile in length were estimated by Mr. Mendies.	3,56,400	673	5,09,225	891	1,566
11	Kusba Hidgellee	Neither grambheries nor drainage channels required.				
	Total	33,59,451	9,305	9,85,989	2,854	12,159
1	Jellamuta	1 2 0	10,13,641	3,040	1,07,960	400*	3,440
2	Taraf Erinch	1 0 0	2,39,792	976	1,69,931	80	1,056
3	„ Bisuan	1 0 0	4,17,670	1,758	39,930	399	2,157
4	Bainda Bazar	1 0 0	1,78,684	51	No drainage channels required.		51
5	Paharpore	1 0 0	2,27,581	1,046	Drainage channels of pergunnah Datta Khoroi serve the purposes of this pergunnah.		1,046
6	Keoramal Nyabad†	1 0 0
7	Bhograi	0 8 0	2,69,711	874	No drainage channels required.		874
8	Khalsa Bhograi	0 8 0	47,762	118	Ditto ditto		118
9	Kalindi Balsbahi	0 8 0	2,94,635	535	23,560	15	550
10	Gaomesh	None.	Neither grambheries nor drainage channels required.				
	Total	26,89,476	8,394	3,41,381	894	9,292

* I have estimated the annual expenditure in Jellamuta to be Rs. 400; but the Deputy Collector entrusted with the re-settlement proposed an initial expenditure of Rs. 8,000 for the complete repair of all drainage channels. This sum, spread over 20 years, gives an average of Rs. 400 every year. At the same time I am of opinion that the drainage of the whole pergunnah Jellamuta should be at once taken in hand and improved, and an immediate expenditure of Rs. 400 only would certainly be utterly insufficient.

† The vernacular ruidad of this pergunnah is not in this office. It was submitted to the Commissioner and has not been returned since. The required information cannot therefore be submitted, but it is not likely that more than Rs. 90-13-7, calculated at a percentage of Rs. 5 on the proposed *mal jumma*, will be required.

Statement showing the former and proposed jummas and percentage thereof in the several pergunnahs of the *Pingamuta and Jellamuta Estates*.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
NAMES OF PER- GUNNAHS.		IN THE FORMER SETTLEMENT.					IN THE PROPOSED RE-SETTLEMENT.				
		Net gross asset, on ac- count of <i>mal</i> lands after deducting barua allow- ance.	Half-rental assessment on account of resumed rent- free tenures, less collection expenses.	Total (columns 3 and 4).	Deduct mili- tary and collection ex- penses on the jumma of <i>mal</i> lands.	Deduct one- eighth of the sum shown in column 6 on account of granary allowance.	Net gross assets on ac- count of <i>mal</i> lands after deducting barua allow- ance.	Half-rental assessment on account of resumed rent- free tenures, less collection expenses.	Total (columns 8 and 9).	Deduct 5 per cent. of the gross as- sets of <i>mal</i> lands on account of re- pairs and main- tenance of granaries and drainage channels.	
1	2	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
1	Majumuta ...	57,092 14 8	6,295 0 3	63,387 14 11	29,937 2 8	2,855 0 0	82,025 5 7	0,437 9 0	82,462 15 1	4,101 4 3	
2	Doro Duman ...	54,066 15 8	10,506 14 3	64,573 1 2	27,878 12 7	2,755 0 0	78,352 0 6	11,116 5 8	89,468 5 4	3,107 7 9	
3	Kiribaku Shipore ...	2,593 7 0	131 14 3	2,724 11 3	1,036 15 7	127 0 0	2,851 11 3	114 2 4	2,965 13 7	3,107 7 9	
4	Kiribaku Shipore ...	1,063 8 9	190 0 7	1,253 8 6	2,593 1 7	127 0 0	2,726 0 6	114 2 4	2,840 2 10	188 2 5	
5	Majna Nyabad ...	1,063 8 9	95 8 10	1,159 12 7	1,696 6 8	114 2 4	1,810 9 0	...	
6	Bahjora ...	6,985 10 7	825 0 8	7,810 11 3	2,791 4 3	349 0 0	9,511 10 2	843 10 10	10,354 10 0	457 9 5	
7	Datta Khorol ...	4,908 15 7	133 1 9	5,041 6 6	1,842 12 7	230 0 0	6,883 11 7	338 7 13	7,221 9 0	294 3 0	
8	Amirabad ...	1,908 8 10	601 3 7	2,509 11 7	721 6 8	90 0 0	3,220 0 0	678 16 10	3,898 6 10	170 4 9	
9	Kisnut Pataspore ...	7,150 9 2	413 0 10	7,563 10 0	2,809 3 8	357 0 0	10,372 7 8	441 6 11	10,813 7 9	570 1 1	
10	Narmanuta ...	8,540 6 4	563 10 0	9,103 6 4	3,336 3 1	417 0 0	12,440 9 5	538 1 0	12,978 9 5	980 13 1	
11	Kuska Hingellee...	5,946 8 7	580 2 10	6,526 8 7	15,993 4 9	538 1 0	16,531 5 9	...	
	Total ...	1,55,374 4 2	20,354 7 11	1,75,728 12 1	57,291 12 2	7,160 0 0	2,31,522 0 6	21,884 8 1	2,53,406 8 7	10,532 7 10	
1	Jellamuta ...	38,028 0 10	2,483 12 0	40,509 12 10	16,210 4 9	1,901 0 0	62,140 12 3	2,887 8 6	65,027 4 9	3,107 7 9	
2	Taral Erinch ...	44,316 4 9	1,065 15 6	45,382 11 6	17,726 8 0	2,216 0 0	74,284 10 11	1,356 14 9	75,640 10 1	3,107 7 9	
3	" Bisuan ...	25,377 15 0	1,304 15 6	26,682 14 6	10,290 8 0	1,279 0 0	43,301 6 9	1,356 14 9	44,657 6 6	2,165 3 7	
4	Banda Hazar ...	1,277 12 0	405 0 8	1,682 12 8	2,537 4 9	323 0 0	15,805 12 5	431 0 2	16,236 12 7	541 4 1	
5	Faharpore ...	6,468 3 0	405 0 9	6,873 12 0	2,537 4 9	323 0 0	10,805 12 5	431 0 2	11,236 12 7	540 4 1	
6	Chharaul Nyabad ...	1,290 1 5	131 14 9	1,422 16 4	488 0 0	61 0 0	1,518 15 11	139 10 7	1,658 10 6	490 13 7	
7	Bhoara ...	9,214 15 3	1,232 11 0	10,447 10 3	3,098 0 0	462 0 0	16,714 8 6	1,304 2 2	18,018 10 8	835 11 7	
8	Khalsa Bhoara ...	2,715 8 3	140 12 6	2,855 15 9	1,086 1 0	136 0 0	5,229 1 11	1,531 11 9	6,760 12 10	201 7 3	
9	Kalindi Balahahi ...	9,038 8 0	1,089 2 0	10,127 0 0	3,613 8 0	452 0 0	17,132 4 5	1,185 2 3	18,317 6 8	856 9 9	
10	Gaomesh ...	1,640 0 8	166 7 0	1,806 7 8	2,947 0 4	168 15 1	3,115 15 5	...	
	Total ...	1,30,533 0 2	7,979 3 9	1,38,502 3 11	55,151 3 6	6,894 0 0	2,35,705 14 1	8,783 10 8	2,44,489 6 9	11,082 15 0	

* Malkana and collection expenses were calculated at Rs. 35 per cent.

J. C. PRICE,
Offg. Settlement Officer.

No. 15A, dated Calcutta, the 7th January 1879.

From—H. L. HARRISON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P.,
To—The Commissioner of the Burdwan Division.

WITH reference to your predecessor's letter No. 814, dated 11th December 1878, and enclosures, regarding the amounts to be allowed to the zemindars in the temporarily-settled estates of Majnamuta and Jellamuta in Midnapore for the maintenance of grambheries and drainage channels, I am desired to request that you will have the amount of the old allowance carefully ascertained from the papers of the settlement of 1845, as proposed in paragraph 18 of Mr. Pellew's letter above referred to, and let the Board know the result of the enquiry.

No. 1061, dated Howrah, the 18th February 1879.

From—T. E. RAVENSHAW, Esq., Commissioner of the Burdwan Division,
To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

IN reply to your No. 15A, dated 7th January 1879, I have the honour to submit the following information received from the Midnapore Collector's office—

“ With reference to the Board's letter No. 15A of the 7th ultimo, received with your memorandum No. 832 of the 17th idem, and subsequent reminder, No. 857 of the 22nd, I have the honour to report that the amount actually allowed on account of grambheries in the old settlement of the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates was 5 per cent. on the jumma of eight pergunnahs in the former and nine in the latter, amounting in the one case to Rs. 7,158, and in the other to Rs. 6,889, as shown in the margin. In the remaining pergunnahs no allowance was made.”

	Rs.		Rs.
Majnamuta ...	2,854	Jellamuta ...	1,901
Doro Dumnai ...	2,734	Taraf Erinch ...	2,215
Narumuta ...	417	" Biswan ...	1,278
Kismut Pataspore ...	357	Bainda Bazar ...	63
Biljora ...	340	Paharpore ...	323
Datta Khoroi ...	230	Nyabad ...	61
Sarifabad ...	127	Bhograi ...	462
Amirabad ...	90	Khalsa Bhograi ...	145
		Kalnsi Balsbahi ...	451
Total ...	7,158	Total ...	6,889

Note by MR. J. C. PRICE in accordance with Mr Dampier's written instructions, dated 26th December 1878.

THERE were employed in the settlement proceedings of the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates five Deputy and Sub-Deputy Collectors. These officers resided for several years during the entire 12 months in the pergunnahs entrusted to them for settlement. They made careful enquiries from the very outset, and finally decided that such and such grambheries were required to be kept up. No person could have had better opportunities for judging of the necessity of keeping up a particular grambhery than the Settlement Officers. I am not prepared to say that the Settlement Officers have included in the list of grambheries which they have given as requiring repairs a single grambhery which can be said to be useless. If every field were embanked it would be so much the better for cultivation. I have

little doubt the ryots pointed out many grambheries as requiring repair which the Settlement Officers rejected. They selected only the principal grambheries, namely such as, if they were not absolutely needed, were at any rate most useful for cultivation. It is said that no data have been given by me to show the principle in which I have estimated the cost that will be required. But in the several pergunnah reports a list of the grambheries that are required to be kept up in each pergunnah is given with particulars, and the estimate of cost is based on the requirement of the grambheries in this list. I do not think the estimate made by the several Settlement Deputy and Sub-Deputy Collectors can well be reduced. I think any sort of further enquiry will result, if grambhery requirements are adequately met, not in a reduction but in an increase. The subordinate Settlement Officers made most careful enquiries. A further enquiry now would not bring to light any matter that was not known and well considered by them.

The 3rd January 1879.

J. C. PRICE.

No. 52T, dated Darjeeling, the 3rd May 1879.

From—A. MACKENZIE, Esq., Secretary to the Government of Bengal,
General and Revenue Departments,

To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, in the Land Revenue
Department.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 221A, dated the 3rd April 1879, with enclosures, and in reply to say that the Lieutenant-Governor accepts the proposals made by the Settlement Officer, Mr. Price, in regard to the annual allowance to be made for the repair and maintenance of grambheries and drainage channels in the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates in the Midnapore district. As recommended by the Board in the concluding paragraph of your letter under acknowledgment, the allowance may be fixed at Rs. 12,159 for Majnamuta and Rs. 9,383 for Jellamuta, or Rs. 21,542 in all, as shown in the statement B submitted with Mr. Price's letter No. 100 of 8th August 1878. The money will be disbursed in the manner indicated in paragraph 2 of my letter No. 782T, dated 6th July last.

2. Due publicity should be given locally to the fact that this liberal allowance for grambheries has been made. It may tend to mitigate opposition to the enhanced rates of rent imposed by the Settlement.

No. 465IA, dated 14th May 1881.

Endorsed by—MAJOR G. F. E. S. NEILL, M.S.C., Assistant Secretary to
the Government of Bengal, Public Works Department.

Copy forwarded to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower
Provinces, for information.

No. 464IA, dated Fort William, 14th May 1881.

From—MAJOR G. F. E. S. NEILL, M.S.C., for Secretary to the Government of Bengal, in the Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch,

To—The Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Bengal.

I AM directed to forward, for information, copy of letter No. 129T of the 6th instant, from the General and Revenue Departments, to the address of the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, communicating the Lieutenant-Governor's sanction to the expenditure of Rs. 12,159 and Rs. 9,383, respectively, for the repairs and maintenance of gram-bheries and drainage channels in the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates in the Midnapore district during 1881-82, and to say that the amounts, aggregating Rs. 21,542, should be charged against the budget allotment of Rs. 2,31,400 for "repairs" in the south-western circle, as per paragraph 15 of the budget orders No. 212JA of the 14th April last.

No. 366A, dated Calcutta, the 27th May 1881.

Endorsed by—H. J. S. COTTON, Esq., Offg. Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

COPY forwarded to the Commissioner of Burdwan for information, in continuation of Board's No. 308A, dated 12th May 1881.

No. 150A, dated Calcutta, the 16th March 1882.

From—H. J. S. COTTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

To—The Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch.

WITH reference to Government order No. 465IA, dated 14th May 1881, I am directed to submit, for the orders of Government, the accompanying copy of a letter from the Commissioner of Burdwan, No. 903, dated 9th March 1882, and of its enclosure, requesting sanction from the 1st July 1882 to the transfer of the expenditure incurred annually in the repairs and maintenance of gram-bheries and drainage channels in the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates in the Midnapore district from the hands of the khas tehsil Deputy Collector to that of the Public Works Department, and to say that the Board approve of the proposal.

No. 903, dated Chinsurah, the 9th March 1882.

From—JOHN BEAMES, Esq., Commissioner of the Burdwan Division,

To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L.P.

WITH reference to your No. 366A, dated 27th May 1881, conveying Government sanction to expenditure for repairing gram-bheries in Majnamuta and Jellamuta, I have the honour to state that on my recent visit to Midnapore the question of the way in which these repairs were executed came up for discussion. Both the Collector and Executive Engineer represented that the present method

of carrying out the repairs by non-professional agency was open to serious objection, and that the work was not only badly done, but there was no means of making sure that the money was in all cases actually spent.

2. The Executive Engineer gave me much useful information on the subject, and expressed a wish to have the work put under the charge of his department. As the Public Works Department has the charge of all the D schedule and contract embankments, and from time to time of tucceavee embankments also, it would be in every way desirable that the repairs of the grammbheries, which form a system of minor embankments subsidiary to, and affected by, the larger ones, should be in the hands of the department also.

3. This arrangement will be the first step towards that more systematic and comprehensive treatment of the embankment and drainage question in the deltaic portion of Midnapore, which I hope will in the course of time be carried out, and without which the tract of country in question will never be free from disastrous floods.

4. I submit copy of a letter, No. 729K, dated 3rd March, written at my request by the Collector, and solicit the sanction of Government and the Board to the transfer recommended therein.

No. 729K, dated Midnapore, the 3rd March 1882.

From—R. H. WILSON, Esq., Collector of Midnapore,

To—The Commissioner of Revenue, Burdwan Division.

You are aware that a sum of Rs. 21,542* is annually at the dis-

	Rs.	posal of the officer in charge of the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates, so long as they remain under khas management, for the purpose of repairing and improving village embankments and drainage channels. Hitherto the expenditure
*Majnamuta	12,169	
Jellamuta	9,383	
Total Rs.	21,542	

of this money has been entrusted to the khas tehsil Deputy Collector, who has for this purpose the assistance of two sub-overseers on Rs. 65 and Rs. 50 respectively. Under Government order No. 5011, dated 15th July 1881, the funds are provided by the Public Works Department, but estimates and bills have to be examined and passed, and works measured up and approved by the Collector of the district and his non-professional subordinates. In other words, there is no real check on the sub-overseers' proceedings, and the Collector can have little knowledge of what is really being done or of what should be done.

2. These arrangements are, I think, very unsatisfactory, and must almost necessarily cause great confusion and waste if they do not give occasion for actual misappropriation of public money; and I therefore beg to propose that from July 1st, 1882, the expenditure of the grammbheries allowance be entrusted to the local officers of the Public Works Department. Both the khas tehsil Deputy Collector and the Executive Engineer of the Cossye Division concur with me in thinking this change desirable. The khas tehsil Deputy Collector and myself will of course give the officers of the Public Works Department

from time to time all the information and assistance which it may be in our power to afford, and the work will be carried out systematically and under proper supervision.

3. As it is now less than a month for the close of the year, I trust that early orders will be passed on this proposal.

No. 811I, dated Calcutta, the 20th April 1882.

From—H. C. LEVINGE, Esq., Secretary to Government of Bengal, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch,

To—The Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 150A of the 16th ultimo, with enclosures, regarding the grambheries and drainage channels of the Majnamuta and Jellamuta estates in the Midnapore district, and in reply to state that, as recommended by the Board, the officers of this department will assume charge of these works from the 1st of July next

No. 204A, dated 25th April 1882.

Endorsed by—C. C. STEVENS, Esq., Offg. Secretary to the Board of Revenue, L. P.

COPY forwarded to the Commissioner of Burdwan for information, with reference to his letter No. 903, dated 9th March 1882.

2. It is presumed that the services of the two overseers employed under the khas tehsil Deputy Collector will be dispensed with.

